

THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

JANUARY, 1843.

ACCOUNT OF THE DISSENTERS IN RUSSIA,

PARTICULARLY OF THE DUEHOVNEE CHRISTIANEE, OR SPIRITUAL
CHRISTIANS.

CHAPTER I.

Incident—Subbotnikes—Duehobortzee—Duehovnee Christianee—Letter by a Dignitary of the Greek Church—Conversation between another Dignitary and three of the Duehobortzee in May 1792.

THE Molokanns of Russia were first brought before the attention of British Christians by the following incident, which occurred many years ago. A party of friends, having gone from St. Petersburg one summer, to visit the romantic scenery at a waterfall in Finland, could find no proper lodgings in a neighbouring village, where it was necessary that they should pass the night. There was no inn, and the huts of the peasantry could afford no separate accommodation for the ladies of the party. They learned, however, that there was a house consisting of two apartments, which was not far distant. It belonged to the Stavist, or peasant-magistrate; and he, with his wife, was from home, but he had left the key in the custody of one of the villagers. They easily obviated a few objections made to their sleeping there; but they had scarcely obtained possession, and made their arrangements for the night, when the Stavist and his wife returned, and expressed great displeasure on finding their house filled with strangers; they soon, however, consented that the party should occupy the better apartment, and they, the kitchen. With this arrangement the host appeared to be satisfied, but, after a time, he was overheard complaining of the inconvenience to which he was subjected. This induced one of the party to go out and pacify him by the gift of a few religious tracts. With these the man was delighted; and his guest, seeing his joy, hastened to bring and present to him a New Testament. When the man opened the volume, and saw what it was, he exclaimed, with joy beaming in his countenance, "Oh!

this will so please my Cossacks !” “What !” said his guest, “have you Cossacks here ?” “Yes ! and fine fellows they are,” was the reply. “What brought *them* here ?” “They were banished to this place many years ago on account of their religion. Now they are forgotten, and here they remain.” “Indeed !” said the guest, “I should like to see them.”

Most of them were then labouring at a distance from the village, and the tourist could not await their return ; but he learned that some of them were employed as gardeners at Wybourg, through which city he had to pass on his return home, and he obtained information where they were to be found.

On arriving at Wybourg, he sent for one of the Cossacks. A tall, intelligent-looking person soon presented himself as such. They entered into a lengthened conversation, and, to the delight of the party, a scriptural and satisfactory reply was given to every question they proposed. At length, one of them said, “Well, brother, you have been a long time in this part of the country ; do you know anything about your ancestors ?” “Oh yes,” said the man, “we know all about them ; we are the descendants of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego ;” intimating that, as these men had been cast into the fiery furnace for refusing to fall down and worship the golden image set up in the plains of Dura, so had they been exiled for refusing to join in what they considered the idolatrous observances of the dominant church. He was then asked, “Do you then never go to church ?” Turning to the interrogator with a piercing look, he said, “I am sure you are not so foolish as to suppose that a *thing* made of *wood*, and *mortar*, and *bricks* can be a *church*. Our Saviour hath declared ‘Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them ;’ such is the church we attend.” He was then informed of what was doing in England and in other countries, for the spread of the truth. His delight was extreme, and he said, “We have long been expecting Jesus Christ to gather his people out of all nations, but did not expect that it was likely to be so soon accomplished. Let me go home to tell my friends the good news. They will greatly rejoice with me.”

A full account of all that passed was prepared, and presented to an influential nobleman, who burst into tears on perusing it, and availed himself of the first opportunity to lay it before his majesty, the late Emperor Alexander. He listened to it with deep interest, and exclaimed, “Oh ! that I had men about me who would tell me the truth ! I never knew that these poor men were exiled on account of their religious sentiments.” He ordered inquiry to be made after all who were suffering for the same cause. About *three hundred* individuals, it is said, were recalled from banishment, and a grant made to them of *some* rich land on the shores of the Sea of Asoph. Thither they removed ; and there the little one became a thousand, and the small one a strong nation.

As no records are kept of their numbers or transactions, it is difficult to procure statistical information concerning this interesting people. The late Emperor Alexander ordered a return of their numbers a short time before his death; and I was informed by one of them that there were then about 40,000 Molokanns, and that they were all peasants or serfs.

The term Molokann is generally applied to them by their countrymen as a term of reproach, like the English designations, Methodist and Quaker. It may be rendered milk-eater; and it is applied to them because they do not abstain from milk, cheese, butter, and other animal food, on those days on which the other Russians fast. It is applied indiscriminately to three distinct bodies; viz. the *Subbotnikes*, the *Duehobortsees*, and the *Duehovnee Christianees*.

The *Subbotnikes*, or Saturday people, are so called from their keeping the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, from which circumstance they have also been called Russian Jews. They hold Unitarian sentiments, and reject the New Testament Scriptures. They are not numerous, and they do not appear to have had any connexion with the other two bodies, excepting that, like them, they are called Molokanns, and they do not disclaim the designation.

The *Duehobortsees*, or *Spiritual Wrestlers*—a designation adopted by themselves—and the *Duehovnee Christianees*, or *Spiritual Christians*, called also *Voskresenkees* or *Sunday-people*, on account of the strictness of their morals, were formerly one body.

I have been unable to ascertain at what time the division took place, but I learned from one of the *Duehovnee Christianees*, that it is reported amongst them, that at one of their meetings for worship many years ago, there were present two old men, both of whom were well acquainted with the Scriptures. One of these, hoping to become a leader amongst his brethren, attempted to persuade the assembly that the Scriptures were of no use—as the Spirit of God would teach men their duty if they only waited his suggestions. When he sat down, the other arose, and endeavoured to prove that the Scriptures afford the only safe rule of conduct: it being easy to prove them inspired by the Spirit of God, but difficult to apply any satisfactory criterion to the alleged leading of the Holy Spirit. A keen controversy ensued; several who were present adopted the sentiments of the former speaker, and many members of the body afterwards embraced the same opinions. Some of these having fallen into immoral practices, the other party considered that it was owing to their erroneous sentiments on the subject in dispute, and refused to associate any longer with those by whom such sentiments were held. The party objecting to the use of the Scriptures, then appropriated the designation *Duehobortsees*; but they objected at the same time to the exclusive claim preferred by the other party, to the designation *Duehovnee Christianees*. One or both

of these designations was probably given, before that time, to the whole body; but now *Duehovnee Christianee* appears to be applied exclusively to the latter party, which is the more numerous, and *Duehobortsee* is applied exclusively to the other.

The only early notice of the Molokanns, with which I am acquainted, is a letter and document, transmitted in 1792, by Gabriel, Metropolitan of Novogorod and St. Petersburg, to the Governor-General of Harkoff, of which the following translation appears in Pinkerton's "Russia."*

"SIR,—Michael Stschireff, and Timothy Suharieff, sent by your Excellency, from the vicinity of Harkoff, have been admonished by Innokentie, Rector of the Nevsky Seminary and Archimandrite. The conversation which took place between them, I forward to you along with this letter.

"I knew the sect as early as 1768. I then admonished them, and succeeded in turning several of them to the church; but on their returning home, they again fell into their former errors. Since I became Archbishop of St. Petersburg I have also spoken to some of the Don-Cossacks, but they remained obstinate. Their obstinacy is founded on enthusiasm. All the demonstration which is presented to them they despise, saying that 'God is present in their souls, and he instructs them;—how shall they then hearken to a man?'—They have such exalted ideas of their own holiness, that they respect that man only, in whom they see the image of God;—that is, perfect holiness. They say, that every one of them may be a prophet, or an apostle; and therefore they are zealous propagators of their own sect. They make the sacraments consist only in a spiritual reception of them, and therefore reject infant baptism. The opinions held by them not only establish *equality*, but also exclude the distinction of ruler and subject; such opinions are therefore the more dangerous, because they may become attractive to the peasantry.—The truth of this, Germany has experienced.—Their origin is to be sought for among the Anabaptists, or Quakers. I know the course of their opinions; and we can have no hope that they will desist from spreading abroad this evil.

"These are my thoughts, which I have considered it my duty to communicate to your Excellency.

"With sincere respect, I am, &c.

"GABRIEL,

"Metropolitan of Novogorod and St. Petersburg.

"May 13th, 1792."

The document referred to in this letter is as follows :—

* pp. 174—185.

A Conversation between the Rector of the Nevsky Seminary of St. Petersburg, Archimandrite Innokentie, and three of the Sect called Duehobortzee, Michael Stschireff, Anikie and Timothy Suharieff, in May, 1792.

Archimandrite. By what means are you come into this state, that people confine you as men dangerous to society?

Duehobortzee. By the malice of our persecutors.

A. What is the cause of their persecuting you?

D. Because it is said, that all who will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.

A. Whom do you call your persecutors?

D. Those who threw me into prison, and bound me in fetters.

A. How dare you in this way speak evil of the established government, founded and acting on principles of Christian piety; which deprives none of their liberty, except such as are disturbers of the public peace and prosperity?

D. There is no higher governor than God, who rules over the hearts of kings and men; but God does not bind in fetters, neither does he command those to be persecuted who will not give his glory to another, and who live in peace, and in perfect love and mutual service to each other.

A. What does that signify, "Who will not give his glory to another?" To whom other?

D. Read the second commandment, and you will know.

A. I perceive then, that you mean to throw censure on those who bow before the images of the Saviour, and of his holy ones.

D. He has placed his image in our souls. Again, it is said, that those who worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.

A. From this it is evident that you have brought yourself into your present condition, by falling into error; by misunderstanding the nature of piety, and entertaining opinions hurtful to the common faith, and to your country.

D. It is not true.

A. How then? Do you not err, when you think that there are powers which exist in opposition to the will of God; whereas there is no power but of God? or that the government, which is appointed to restrain and correct the disobedient and unruly, persecutes piety; whereas he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil?

D. What evil have we done? None.

A. Do you not hurt the faith by your false reasoning concerning her holy ordinances, and by your blind zeal against God; like to the Jews of old, whose zeal was not according to knowledge?

D. Let knowledge remain with you! Only do not molest us who

live in peace, pay the taxes, do harm to no one, and respect and obey earthly governments.

A. But, perhaps, your paying the taxes, harming no one, and obeying earthly governments, is only the effect of necessity, and of the weakness of your power ; while your peace and love respect those only who are of your own opinion.

D. Construe our words as you choose.

A. At least, it is far from being disagreeable to you, I suppose, to behold your society increasing.

D. We desire good unto all men, and that all may be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth.

A. Leave off your studied secresy, and evasive and dubious answers. Explain and reveal to me your opinions candidly, like men who have nothing in view but to discover truth.

D. I understand you ; for that same Spirit of Truth which enlightens us in this respecting faith and life, assists us also to discover affectation and deceit, in any man. Nevertheless, in order to get rid of your importunity, and with boldness to preach the true faith, I shall answer your questions as I am able.

A. By what way—by the assistance of others, or by the aid of your own reasoning powers only—did you obtain this Spirit of Truth ?

D. He is near our hearts, and, therefore, no assistance is necessary. A sincere desire and ardent prayers are alone requisite.

A. At least, you ground your opinions on the Word of God ; do you not ?

D. I do ground myself on it.

A. But the Word of God teaches us, that God has committed the true faith and the dispensing of his ordinances, and of instruction in piety, to certain persons chosen and ordained for this purpose. "According to the grace of God given unto me," says Paul, "as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation."

D. True ; and such were our deputies who were sent hither in 1767 and 1769. But what did the spirit of persecution and of wrath do to them ? Some were taken for soldiers, others were sent into exile.

A. You doubtless intend, by these deputies, some well-meaning people like yourself ?

D. Yes !

A. But you, and people like you, though well-meaning, cannot be either ministers or teachers of the holy faith.

D. Why not ?

A. Because a church cannot be established by individual authority, as is manifest from 1 Cor. iii. 5. Secondly, because special talents and gifts from above are requisite, to make us able ministers of the New Testament, 2 Cor. iii. 6. And, thirdly, it is absolutely necessary to this lawful and gracious calling, that we possess that ordina-

tion which has remained in the holy church from the times of the apostles; as it is said, "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," Eph. iv. 11, 12.

D. There is no other calling to this office required, than that which crieth in our hearts; neither doth our learning consist in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. Are the gifts which you require, such as to be able to gabble Latin?

A. You do not understand the Holy Scriptures, and this is the source of all your errors. The apostle, in the words quoted by you, does not reject the talents and gifts of acquired knowledge, but contrasts the doctrines of Jesus Christ with the wisdom of the heathen, which was in repute at that time. And that the calling of pastors and teachers always depended on the church by which they were chosen, is manifest from the very history of those pastors and teachers of the church, who are eternally glorified.

D. What Holy Scriptures? What church? What do you mean by the Holy Scriptures?

A. Did not yourself say, that you founded your opinions on the Word of God? That is what I mean by the Holy Scriptures.

D. The Word of God is spiritual, and immaterial; it can be written on nothing but on the heart and spirit.

A. Yet when the Saviour saith, "Search the Scriptures," and gives us the reason for this command:—"For in them ye think ye have eternal life,"—can he really understand thereby anything else than the written Word of God? This is the treasure which he himself hath entrusted to his holy church, as the unalterable rule of faith and life.

D. And what do you call a church?

A. An assembly of believers in Jesus Christ, governed by pastors, according to regulations founded on the Word of God, and partakers of the ordinances of faith.

D. Not so: there is but one pastor, Jesus Christ, who laid down his life for the sheep; and one church, holy, apostolical, spiritual, invisible, of which it is said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them;" in which no worship is paid to any material object; where those only are teachers, who live virtuous lives; where the Word of God is obeyed in the heart, on which it descends like dew upon the fleece, and out of which it flows as from a spring in the midst of the mountains; where there are no such noisy, ostentatious, offensive, and idolatrous meetings, and vain ceremonies, as with you; no drunken and insulting pastors and teachers like yours; nor such evil dispositions and corruptions as among you.

A. You have here mixed up many things together : let us consider them one by one :—

1st. That the Saviour, Christ, is the only chief pastor and head of the church is a truth ; for he hath founded it by his own merits ; under his almighty providence it exists, is guarded, and protected ; and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. Spiritually, Christ is united to it ; for, " Behold, I am with you even to the end of the world ;" and by the power of his grace, he helpeth the prayers and petitions of believers. But it does not seem good to the wisdom and majesty of God, that all, without distinction, should be engaged in the external state and service of the church, which is so closely united to the internal ; and therefore, from the very first ages, this has been committed unto worthy pastors and teachers, as stewards of the mysteries of God.

2ndly. I said that the external state of the church is very closely united to the internal. Certainly it is so. Who does not know how powerfully the passions and the flesh work in us, both to good and evil, according to the nature of the object presented to them ? We have need to recruit the efforts of our minds by such salutary aids ; and to stir up the expiring flame of piety within us, by memorials of the goodness of God, and of the example of holy men. Here is the whole of what you so improperly style material and idolatrous worship. So long as we are united to matter, that is, to the body, we can never reach that pure and inward spiritual worship of God which the holy angels present unto him, or such as that of the eternally glorified saints ; and on this account, when God requires that we should worship him in spirit and in truth, it is to warn us against shameful hypocrisy, or other dispositions of mind, not corresponding with our external worship.

3dly. With respect to the scandalous lives of some pastors, they can never harm the essence of faith, for that is not the cause of their bad conduct. And that their irregularities can never excuse those who, on this account, leave the church and despise her doctrine, is witnessed by the Saviour himself, in his discourse with the pharisees : " The scribes and pharisees sit in Moses' seat," saith he ; " all therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do ; but do not ye after their works, for they say and do not." Moreover Christian humility should have deterred you from judging so rashly concerning general corruption and evil dispositions. But I have purposely not yet answered several of your expressions, such as " idolatrous meetings and vain ceremonies," that I might first ask you what you mean by them.

D. You may conjecture that yourself.

A. Well, do not even you show becoming respect for the characters

of those who have been distinguished for holiness, and after death glorified by God, as patterns of faith and virtue?

D. When and whom hath God thus glorified?

A. Are the names of Chrysostom, Gregory the Great, and such like, not known to you?

D. I know them.

A. What do you think of them?

D. What do I think? Why, they were men!

A. But holy men, whose faith and lives were agreeable to God; and on this account they are miraculously glorified from above.

D. Well, let us suppose so.

A. Then it is to them that the church is indebted for all those offices and ceremonies which you denominate idolatrous and vain; and the worship of images has been declared not to be sinful, by the council of the holy fathers. How then, will you make this agree with your views?

D. I know not. I only know that hell will be filled with priests, and deacons, and unjust judges. As for me, I will worship God as he instructs me.

A. But can you, without danger, depend on yourself? Are you not afraid, that sometimes you may mistake your own opinions, and even foolish imaginations, for Divine inspiration?

D. How? To prevent this, reason is given unto us. I know what is good, and what is bad.

A. A poor dependence! With the best reason, sometimes good appears to be evil, and evil to be good.

D. I will pray to God. He will send his word; and God never deceives.

A. True, God never deceives; but you deceive yourself, assuring yourself of that on his part which never took place.

D. God does not reject the prayers of believers.

A. Believers! True, those requests which are agreeable the law of faith, Divine wisdom will not reject; but "ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss." For this purpose hath he given the book of his Divine word, that in it we may behold his will, and that our petitions may be directed according to it. But it is vain to expect in the present day miraculous and immediate inspirations, without sufficient cause, particularly such as are unworthy of him; and to pretend to such inspirations and revelations, is very hurtful to society, and therefore ought to be avoided.

D. But to me they appear to be very useful, salutary, and worthy of acceptance.

A. What! to break off from the society of your countrymen, though united with you by the same laws and the same articles of faith, and to introduce strange doctrines, and laws of your own making? to begin to

expound the doctrines of the Gospel, without the aid of an enlightened education, disregarding the advice of such men as are most versed and experienced in those things; and out of your own head to found upon all this a separate society? Is it not also to rise against your country when you refuse to serve it, when the sanctity of an oath is required? Should not the simple command of the higher powers be sufficient to unite you with others to defend your country, your fellow-citizens, and your faith?

D.

A. Why do you make no answer to this?

D. There is nothing to say. I am not so loquacious as you, neither have I need of it.

A. But do you not see, at least, whither your blind zeal is leading you, and that you deserve to suffer much more than all that has befallen you? We look for your repentance and amendment.

D. Do what you choose with us: we are happy to suffer for the faith: this is no new thing. Did you ever hear the old story?

A. Tell me, I pray you, what story?

D. A certain man planted a vineyard, and set an hedge about it, and digged a place for the wine-fat, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country. And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant, that he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruit of the vineyard; and they caught him, and beat him, and sent him away empty. And again he sent another; and him they killed, and many others; beating some, and killing some. Having yet therefore an only son, his well beloved, he sent him also last unto them, saying, They will reverence my son. But those husbandmen said among themselves, This is the heir, come, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours. And they took him, and killed him, and cast him out of the vineyard. What shall therefore the lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others. Now I have done with you.

A. At least answer me this: How can it be reconciled, that you reject the Holy Scriptures, and at the same time endeavour to support yourself upon them?

D. Argue as you will; I have spoken what was necessary, and shall not say another word.

J. C. B.

Haddington.

THE PARTS AND TOPICS OF PRAYER.

"Prayer is appointed to convey
The blessings God designs to give ;
Long as they live should Christians pray,
For only while they pray they live."

WHAT does prayer include? The term properly means, to intreat, to supplicate, and when used to express a religious act, it means to address petitions to God ; to ask anything at his hands. But it has a wider signification ; and prayer, in common speech, is the general name for all those direct addresses to God, which are not sung, whether they are audibly or inaudibly presented ; and of which petition forms a part.

In the Catechism of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, prayer is said to be, "the offering up of our desires to God, for things agreeable to his will, in the name of Christ ; with confession of our sin, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies." Dr. Watts divides it into the following parts : invocation, adoration, confession, petition, pleading, self-dedication, thanksgiving, blessing, and the Amen, or conclusion. The former definition I think defective, the latter unnecessarily minute ; and would submit, as more complete than the one, and not less expressive than the other, the following, and say,—that prayer embraces adoration, thanksgiving, confession, supplication, and self-dedication.

It may not be necessary that every address to Almighty God should contain the whole of these, to constitute it prayer ; or that they should be introduced in the order here adopted. There are seasons when circumstances may dictate the propriety of giving the prominence, or even of confining our addresses, to one of these matters. Now, praise may especially become us, then, confession ; at one time adoration, at another petition ; and surely there are seasons when the hour of prayer may be most suitably employed in the solemn work of self-consecration ; whilst sometimes the exercise may begin with confession, and end with thanksgiving, &c. Yet prayer, as usually understood, includes the whole ; the uniform omission of any one would render the offering imperfect, and the above order is, perhaps, at once the most simple and natural.

Adoration is the serious and solemn mention of the names and attributes, the works and ways of God, in terms expressive of reverence and admiration, of satisfaction and joy. The Psalmist says, "For the Lord is great. Honour and majesty are before him : strength and beauty are in his sanctuary." "Thou art great, and doest wondrous things ; thou art God alone." The seraphim cried one to another, and said, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts ; the whole earth is full of his glory." In the heavenly world, the redeemed from among men,

the angels that are before the throne, and all the heavenly host, rest not day and night, but present their united adorations, and say, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty." "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."

"Honour to whom honour is due, fear to whom fear;" and surely we may add, adoration to whom adoration. But the great God is the *only being* whom it is proper to adore. We are required to *love* the whole brotherhood of man; to *fear* the magistrate, who beareth the sword on earth; the cherubim, the seraphim, and the holy angels, we may regard with wonder and admiration; we may remember, in order to imitate, the conversation and worth of departed saints; but we may not bow down and worship them. If it is lawful to ask God to give them charge concerning us, yet *them* we must not even invoke. Adoration, worship, is a religious act; it belongs to their God and ours alone. He only is worthy of it; whilst it is equally due to him, and befitting in us.

And in this part of religious worship, who has not felt that there is something truly elevating and inspiring? It brings the character and glory of God immediately before the mind; more fully and vividly than any other part of devotion, it realizes to us his might and majesty, his wisdom and condescension, his justice and mercy, his holiness and truth. It makes us directly conversant with all that is grand, and sublime, and lovely. It takes the mind into the highest region to which it can soar; it leads us to the seat of God, conducts us to his pavilion, and brings us to his fellowship; we were created for this work; till we enter upon it we do not rise to our proper rank in the scale of being; we sacrifice the glory and dignity of our nature, and leave unexercised some of our noblest powers. But when employed in *adoring* the great Object of our worship, we feel that we are performing an appropriate part, and using aright our divinest faculties. We are raised above humanity and earth; we become companions of angels in their loftiest employ. By that vision of God, that meditation on his insufferable glories, which the work of adoration necessitates, our nature is transformed; we are made conscious of being one with the Father and the Son; though we cannot but be humbled, we are filled with joy, and experience the same hallowed and delightful results with Moses on Horeb, and the disciples on Tabor, and Paul when caught up to the third heavens, and the Son of Man himself at Olivet or Gethsemane. The solitude, if I may so express myself, of the Majesty on high, gives depth to our emotions, and power to the exercise. The angels excel in strength; but I cannot worship them. The Lord, *He* is the God, and He alone. I am now in his presence, adoring the only Lord God. I am sure that I am right. There is a grandeur and an elevation in the employment; there is a sacred might in the influence it exerts; there is

an intensity in the satisfaction it brings, altogether peculiar, and which cannot be experienced in any other exercise.

Thanksgiving and *praise* ought to form a part of our addresses to God. Adoration has respect to God's own glory, or to the manifestations of that glory which he has made. We magnify his name because he is *God*; we praise him because he is *our God*, and deals with us in wisdom, and faithfulness, and truth. Every good and every perfect gift comes to us from his hand. He is perpetually acting as our Preserver, Benefactor, Saviour, Father, and Friend. From the same fountain he supplies us with temporal and eternal benefits. We have received innumerable mercies in answer to prayer; he has bestowed on us ten thousand times ten thousand which we never solicited. There is no image to represent the constancy, the profusion, or the excellency of his gifts. The breath of life which circulates round the globe, sometimes comes charged with pestilence. The sun, which is ever shining on some part of our world, yet leaves each in occasional darkness. God alone is always doing us good. If our nature were not disordered, thanksgiving would be a natural dictate—a spontaneous employment. The renewed man cannot withhold it. Morning and evening, and all day long, when he thinks of what he receives from God, sentiments of gratitude arise in his breast, which must have utterance in the language of praise. One part of the office of the ancient Levite was to stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord; and likewise at evening. We are expressly told that David composed the 96th, the 105th, and the 136th Psalms, to thank the Lord; and these, with others, were used as the appropriate thanksgiving odes of the Jewish church; also the Apostle Paul, in all his epistles, mentions it as his constant practice, to offer thanks to God for his goodness, both towards himself, and to all the saints. Our obligations are as numerous as theirs, or more abundant; and if we would bring to God that worship which is due to his name, praise must be frequently, fervently, and cheerfully offered. Its omission is a serious defect. In case of benefits received, even from man, the offering of gratitude, though it may sometimes be felt to be humiliating, is proper. How much more proper when God is the giver; whilst his being God not only takes away whatever is irksome or distasteful, but renders it a most delightful and salutary exercise. Indeed, we are so constituted, that it is not possible for a creature to be happy, who lives without the offering of praise to God.

But the *discipline* which God exercises over us, not less than the direct and positive good he confers upon us, is a suitable topic for thanksgiving. It may often be trying and severe; but its purifying and corrective tendency places it amongst our real blessings. Hence the Psalmist said, "I will sing of mercy and of judgment; unto thee, O

Lord, will I sing." Yes, it is by the chequered character of our lot—by the due admixture of evil with good in our histories—by the commingling of darkness and light—that some of the most salutary lessons we learn are conveyed; some of the greatest spiritual evils to which we are exposed warded off; and some of the most valuable of the fruits of the Spirit made to grow and flourish.

And perhaps there is no feature whatever, in God's providential government, more surprising and admirable than this. Not only does he condescend to order the lot of each individual, but he exactly adapts it to our peculiar character and necessities. He both adjusts the burden to the back, and fits the back to the burden. When he sends heavy judgments, he attempers them with sure consolations; when he gives great mercies, he accompanies them with evils, that tend to recall us to sobriety and vigilance; and even when he leads us in a way in which there is nothing peculiar to enchant or annoy, he usually puts into our *daily* cup a wise proportion of the bitter and the sweet; and it is this admixture of light and darkness, of evil and good, that is so advantageous to our soul. If all were goodness, we should soon be full, and deny God; if all were severity, we should perish in our afflictions; but they are mingled, and their joint influence on our spiritual health is matter for devout and grateful praise. The operation is often secret and silent; the advantages are seldom at once perceptible; and sometimes we cannot tell how the result is produced; yet, it is *produced*; and the good man, on reviewing his history, is often filled with astonishment, both at the issue itself, and at the manner in which it has been brought about. He would not that one thing should have been changed, in the way by which he has been led; he sees how adversity furnishes matter for praise, as well as prosperity; and now deeply feels the force and propriety of the apostle's admonition, "Be careful for nothing; but in *everything*, by prayer and supplication, *with thanksgiving*, let your requests be made known to God."

Again, *confession* forms an appropriate part of those addresses to God, which we denominate prayer. So obvious is this duty, that not a tribe of men, believing in the existence of a God, has ever been discovered, by whom it was not practised; whilst those who possess the Scriptures, apprehend at once its propriety and necessity. Confession of one kind was doubtless a part of the devotion of Paradise; but it was the confession which the angels themselves rejoice to make, as they worship in the temple above. They know how little, how infinitely little they are, in the presence of the King Eternal; and they veil their faces with their wings, and cast their crowns at his feet, while they acknowledge their dependence, celebrate his fulness, and exalt his name. How much more reason have we, in the same lowly spirit, to imitate their example; and with what emphasis should we acknowledge that

our being is but of yesterday, and our foundation in the dust, and say, "Lord, what is man, that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man, that thou visitest him?"

But we are *guilty* as well as little, polluted as well as dependent; and have other acknowledgments to make. It is true, that where sin abounded, grace has much more abounded; so that we, who have fallen far lower than the angels, may regain a state of blessedness, which even they might desire; but this does not affect the fact of our sinfulness, nor release us, while on earth at least, from the suitable exercises of contrition and godly sorrow. The Gospel provides for the remission of all sin, and promises justification freely to the ungodly; but it represents the confession of sin both as meet and necessary; it nowhere describes it as the procuring cause of mercy, but it uniformly speaks of it as indispensable to its bestowment. It is the duty of the saint, as well as the sinner; it will remain his duty to the latest hour of life. As long as we continue to transgress—as long as any lust remain unsubdued—as long as our faith is marked by feebleness, or our love by variations—till every vestige of corruption is put off with this vile body, and we are made to bear the exact image of Christ—so long must we approach God in the character of sinners; bear the reproach and shame which that condition incurs; and acknowledge our guilt and just condemnation.

Confession, which is thus necessary, should be *particular*. It is not enough for us to acknowledge that we are sinners in common with others; our acknowledgments must spring from a due sense of *our own* transgressions. What *we* have done amiss—what *we* have omitted to do, must be mentioned before God. The heart is so deceitful, and the conscience so unfaithful, that it is possible for a man to select the most humiliating penitential expressions which the sacred Volume can supply, and use them before God, without one emotion of true humiliation or penitence for his own sins. Reader, have you not found it so? Have you not risen frequently from your knees, after employing language of the deepest abasement, conscious that there has been no real sense of guilt; no such acknowledgment of it as the character of God requires, or as you feel to be suitable to your state? The fact is, of *your own* iniquities you did not think. The specific sins that are separating you from God, the specific charges that stand against you in the book of his remembrance, engaged not your serious attention, and you contented yourself with general language. But this is no confession at all. You may have used deceit, but this you have not told God; you may have committed adultery in your heart, or been guilty of that covetousness which is idolatry, but these you have not noticed before him; you may have yielded to ungovernable tempers, to pride, to murmuring, to distrust, but respecting these your tongue has been dumb. And the very end of your bowing at his foot-

stool is unattained. Were the child to refuse to confess to you the specific acts of disobedience of which he was guilty, and content himself with the general admission of faultiness, you would not be satisfied, nor could you fully and entirely forgive him. As you would desire *him* to deal with *you*, so must you deal with God;—and make your personal delinquencies and guilt the subject of frequent and sincere acknowledgment.

Confession should be full and unreserved. It must relate to *our own sins* to constitute it *genuine* confession; it must embrace *all* our sins, to make it *acceptable* and *complete*; at least, *none* must be *designedly* omitted; we had better not bend the knee before Him than dissemble or cloak our faults. By concealment nothing can be gained; by Him they are already known. Not the most secret is hidden from his eye. Let us then confess them freely; let us tell him all. The very attempt to dissemble, while it indicates an impenitent heart, involves the guilt of deceit, and is displeasing to God. "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me." It inflicts on our own soul the most serious injury; it sears the conscience; it kindles a fire in the bones; it turns aside the current of Divine mercy, and sends back the messenger of peace. "He that covereth his sin shall not prosper." Let us then, with respect to *all our sins*, whether small or great, secret or known, let us acknowledge them fully and ingenuously to our Father who is in heaven.

It is eminently fit, and will be attended with the happiest results. It will disencumber the mind; it is an important part of the curative process; it is well-pleasing to God; it is intimately connected with the nature and enjoyment of his favour; for, "whoso confesseth and forsaketh his sins, shall have mercy." Reader, have you done it, or have you kept silence, and is your soul in bitterness? then go, go at once to the place of prayer, impressed with your exceeding sinfulness. Your Father's ear is open, hide not your sin; your Father's heart yearns with compassion, plead your guilt and woe; your Father's hand holds out the sceptre of mercy, touch it, and receive forgiveness.

Let your confession be humble; let it proceed from a contrite heart; let it be attended with a just sense of demerit, and an entire reliance on the mercy of the Lord Jesus Christ. Consider the character of the Being whose law you have broken, and whose Gospel you so long despised; and say, "Against *thee, thee only*, have I sinned." Remember that "the sacrifices of God are a broken and contrite heart." Abhor yourself in dust and ashes; offer no excuses; think not to justify yourself before God. You deserve his wrath instead of his grace. He would be glorified in your condemnation. Challenge not his righteousness, but stand before the mercy-seat, and in the attitude of a penitent there abide; it is your proper place; you may feel it to be humiliating, but it will be attended with inward satisfaction, and your cry shall be

heard. As you look to the Lamb of God, by whose blood you are sprinkled, your burden shall fall from your back; and you shall hear a voice from above the cherubim, saying, "Lo, thy sin is taken away, and thine iniquity is purged."

T. W.

(To be continued.)

A VINDICATION OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF ACTS XIII. 48.

"And as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

SIR,—I was not a little surprised to hear a metropolitan minister of high repute assert, on a recent Sabbath morning, that the last clause of Acts xiii. 48 is "the most practical text in the whole Bible;" asserting also that the authorized is not the proper translation, which it certainly could not be in that case. I had been wont to regard it as conveying a great truth, but not an eminently practical truth. However, I of course at once deferred to the talent and research of such a master of Israel. And this I did still more readily, as he sustained his position by the sanction of the learned and liberal Doddridge. Yet, as neither our pastors require, nor our people render, implicit faith in their instructions, I have since "searched whether this thing be so." And having confirmed, rather than controverted my previous conviction by a careful inquiry, I now submit to you the results of the process, in the hope that, if there be one, the flaw in my reasoning may be pointed out and proved to me. I must however, acknowledge that I am ignorant of the regular rules of criticism, and so was compelled to adopt my own course.

My first care was to compare the English rendering with the Greek original. In the latter I found *καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον* of which the former, "And as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed," seemed an almost literal translation. But the whole controversy evidently resting on the real meaning of the word *τεταγμένοι*, I looked for *τάσσω*, (of which it is a form,) in Donnegan's Lexicon. He gives as its various meanings, "to place, or put in order,—to order, command, or decree, to impose by an order or edict,—to assign, to appoint,—to arrange or dispose in a determined order, to draw out, or place troops in battle array." This last is the idea commonly conveyed by it; it being used in a figurative sense, drawn from the act of the general marshalling his troops; like our "tactics," which is derived from it; and never referring, any more than that term, to the soldiers themselves, except as passive. And so it is always a transitive verb. As some however render the word here "were

ordained," and others, "were disposed, that is, disposed themselves;" I sought to determine the true rendering by a consideration of parallel passages, first in the New Testament, then in the Septuagint, and then in classic authors; and by a comparison of our own with other versions.

The first passage of the New Testament in which the word in question occurs is Matt. xxviii. 16: "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed (*ἐράξατο*) them." In Luke vii. 8, the centurion says, "For I also am a man set (*τασσόμενος*) under authority, having under me soldiers." We read in Acts xv. 2, that the brethren at Antioch "determined" (*ᾔρασαν*) that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them should go up to Jerusalem. In the address of the Lord to Saul recorded in the twenty-second chapter, it is said, verse 10, "Arise and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed (*ῥέταται*) for thee to do." In the account of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome we are told, xxviii. 23, that "when they had appointed (*ταξάμενοι*) him a day, there came many to him into his lodging." In Romans xiii. 1, it is declared that "the powers that be are ordained (*τεταγμέναι*) of God." And in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, it is recorded to the honour of the house of Stephanas, "that they had addicted themselves (*ᾔρασαν ἑαυτοὺς*) to the ministry of the saints." In all these cases, (the only ones in which it occurs,) it will be seen that there is involved in the verb *τάσσω* a command, order, or direction given by one person to another, whatever form may be used; except indeed in the last instance, where the verb is qualified by the pronoun *ἑαυτοὺς* following; which makes a different English construction necessary, although the same idea remains.

Compounds of this verb often occur; and always with a similar meaning.—*Διατάσσω*, to command, ordain, arrange, is used Matt. xi. 1: "And it came to pass when Jesus had made an end of commanding (*διατάσων*) his twelve disciples, he departed thence to teach and to preach in their cities." Luke viii. 55; Acts vii. 44; 1 Cor. ix. 14, &c. *Ἐπιτάσσω*, to command, is found in Mark i. 27: "For with authority commandeth (*ἐπιτάσσει*) he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him." Mark ix. 25; Luke viii. 25; Acts xxiii. 2; Phil. 8, &c.—*Υποτάσσω*, to arrange under, to subordinate, (mid.) to be subject, is of very frequent occurrence. In 1 Cor. xv. 27, it is said: "For he hath put (*ὑπέταξεν*) all things under his feet." See also Ephes. i. 22; Phil. iii. 21; Tit. ii. 5; Heb. ii. 5, 8; 1 Pet. iii. 1, &c.—The verbal noun *τάξις* also is often used for "order," especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews for an "order" of priesthood; which must be instituted or ordained by some other than the person exercising it, since it is expressly declared that "no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as Aaron." We find *τάγμα* also once with the same signification. In all these cases then, (and

many more such might be cited,) we have in the original term a direct reference to a command given or arrangement made; and at best but a secondary allusion, if any at all, to the obedience rendered. Such then is the sum of the evidence I could collect from the New Testament itself in support of our rendering of *ἦσαν τεταγμένοι*, "were ordained."

I next consulted the Septuagint, to see if its more ancient authors concurred with those of the New Testament in the application of this word. And I found that they too repeatedly employ it in reference to an act of authority or power, to a commandment or appointment. It is the frequent synonyme for the Hebrew *נָתַן*, to put, set, place, draw up, appoint, constitute; which is always a transitive verb. For example, 2 Sam. xxiii. 23, "And David set (*ἔταξεν*) him over his guard." 2 Kings x. 24, "Jehu appointed (*ἔταξεν*) fourscore men without." Job xxxi. 24; Jer. v. 22; Ezek. xix. 5; Hab. i. 12; Zech. vii. 12, &c. It is occasionally put in place of *נָתַן*, which has precisely the same signification as the preceding. Thus Job xiv. 13, "Oh that thou wouldest appoint (*τάξῃ*) me a set time." Also Jer. iii. 13, "But I said, How shall I put (*τάξω*) thee among the children?" &c. And it is sometimes equivalent to *נָתַן*, to give, put, place, set over, make, constitute; as in 1 Chron. xvi. 4: "And he appointed (*ἔταξε*) certain of the Levites to minister before the ark of the Lord." From all these, and numerous other passages which I examined, I concluded that the LXX. were followed in their use of the word by the evangelic and apostolic writers. And this strengthened my conviction that we rightly read, "were ordained."

I turned however for further confirmation to the classic Greek writers, to see whether the usage of the sacred writers was peculiar to them, or common to them with the profane. The latter I found to be the fact. Xenophon and Thucydides use it continually in reference to the drawing up, or marshalling an army. In Epictetus c. xxix. there is this passage: *Τῶν δὲ βελτίστων σοὶ φαινομένων οὕτως ἔχον, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμένους εἰς ταύτην τὴν τάξιν* "But so regard those things which appear to thee best, as appointed by God to that position." Marcus Antoninus (xi. 13) says that man is *τεταγμένος πρὸς τὸ γίνεσθαι, δι' οὗ δὴ τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον*, "ordained to accomplish that which will prove of common advantage." Philostratus has the expression, *τάττει ἀγέλην*, "to order a flock." Plutarch, in his character of Pompey, represents him as *σώφρονα καὶ τεταγμένον ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις*, "wise and well regulated in his desires." Polyænus speaks of well disciplined troops as *συντεταγμένοι*, and of the disorderly as *ἀσυντάκτοι*. So Ælian terms soldiers *τεταγμένοι*, when drawn up in their ranks, and *ἄτακτοι*, when disbanded; and uses *τάγμα* for a troop. And Philo, speaking of those who have devoted themselves to the service of God, says, *Οἱ τὴν παρὰ τῷ ὄντι Θεῷ τεταγμένοι τάξιν, ἀθανάτον βίον ζῶσιν*, "They being marshalled in the rank next to the true God, live an immortal life." These

few phrases from different authors seem to me to prove that the word *ῥάσσω* does always refer to a submission to external authority, to a disposition from without, and not from within. And thus they harmonize with our version of the text under discussion.

Still further to establish our reading, I compared it with several standard versions. And these too support it. The venerable Syriac must be thus translated, "And those believed who were destined (literally, placed,) to the life which is eternal." The real participle used must be rendered passively; and accordingly Schaaf gives for it "positi" in his Testament; but "destinati" in his Lexicon, quoting this verse: with the Syriac the Arabic exactly agrees. The Æthiopic, slightly altering the construction, gives the same sense yet more strongly, thus: "And when the Gentiles had heard this, they were glad, and glorified God, who had imparted to them eternal life." The Vulgate reads, "Et crediderunt quod erant præordinati ad vitam æternam;" "And as many as were pre-ordained to eternal life, believed;" a clear proof how Jerome understood the passage; and with him the whole western church. Luther renders the whole verse; "Da es aber die heiden höreten, wurden sie froh, und priesen das wort des Herrn, und wurden gläubig, wie viel ihren zum ewigen leben verordnet waren;" "But when the Gentiles heard it, they rejoiced, and praised the word of the Lord, and believed, as many of them as were appointed to eternal life." The French versions of Ostervald and of Martin have, "Et tous ceux qui etaient destinés à la vie éternelle crurent;" "And all those who were destined to eternal life, believed." That of Geneva has, "etaient ordonnés," "were ordained." And in Diodati's Italian the clause stands, "E tutti coloro ch'erano ordinati a vita eterna credettero;" "And all those who were ordained to eternal life, believed." These examples will be sufficient to show that the prevailing opinion of the best translators of the New Testament was in harmony with that of the authors of our version on this point.

Thus, then, my investigations, to their full extent, prove that the New Testament writers, the Seventy, classic authors, and editors of the authorized versions, all support our reading, "ordained."

I must, however, now admit that, while no one pretends to prove that this is not a proper rendering, some modern translators contend that here it is not the proper, and give us different renderings. According to Mede, "Those who had given their names to eternal life, believed;" or, "Those who stood in readiness for eternal life, believed." But it is unnecessary here to prove the doctrinal or the critical error involved in these, since they are explanations, not translations, paraphrases, not proofs; as is also his suggestion that the *παραγμένους* were "proselytes of the gate!" which, though pronounced by Hammond a "not unhappy conjecture," fails entirely from want of any foundation. The "Improved Version (!)" has, after Hammond, "And as many as were

disposed to everlasting life, believed." Mr. Wakefield ascribes to the pen of the chaste chronicler of the Apostles' Acts this vapid sentiment; "And as many as were so disposed, believed unto eternal life." Yet surely he ought to have known "the beloved physician" better.

Archbishop Newcome gives the text as since adopted into the Improved Version, and says in a note, "Another import of the words is, As many of the Gentiles believed as were inwardly disposed to receive the doctrine of everlasting life; as had an orderly and well prepared mind for that purpose; as had disposed themselves to it." And Schmidius, Calovius, &c. render it, "And those who had followed the appointment of God (*τάξις Θεοῦ*) believed." But where are the proofs of these various hypotheses? With those who rest their objection to the word "ordained" on their direct denial of the doctrine of election, I hold now no controversy. They are in this case consistent; and must be converted from that error before they can be convinced of this. Some, however, who believe that doctrine, yet deny that it is involved in the text. The word *τεταγμένοι*, it is said, cannot refer to this, for the Scripture is wont to express election and predestination by other terms, such as *ὁρισμένοι* and *προωρισμένοι* and here moreover it does not mention them as *προτεταγμένοι*, but simply *τεταγμένοι*. Now the first of these assertions is no argument, since the New Testament writers may and do use different words to express the same general idea. And the second is answered by the first, for if *ὁρισμένοι* does not need the *πρὸ*, no more does *τεταγμένοι*. And to "ordain" is obviously the same thing in fact as to "pre-ordain." But it is said again, Suppose the term "ordained" is admitted, the question comes, by whom were they ordained? by themselves or another? No other is mentioned, therefore it must be themselves. And then to prove that this passive form may have an active reciprocal sense, a few such passages as these are adduced; from Xenophon, *ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν ταπτομένοι*, "drawn up by themselves;" and *τάττω ἑμαυτὸν εἰς δουλείαν*, "I subject myself to slavery;" and the passage already quoted from the First Epistle to the Corinthians; "They had addicted themselves (*ἔρασαν ἑαυτοὺς*) to the ministry of the saints." These, however, seem directly to disprove the conclusion for which they contend. For what makes these sentences reflexive but the introduction of the reflexive pronouns, *ἑαυτῶν*, *ἑμαυτὸν*, and *ἑαυτοὺς*? Where these are found, I admit, I adopt their translation. But if they cannot, when seeking, find a single sentence with a similar meaning, yet without any such pronoun, I must conclude that it modifies the sense. Chrysostom renders *τεταγμένοι* in this place *ἀφωρισμένοι τῷ Θεῷ*, "separated to God;" which certainly is equivalent to "ordained," according to New Testament usage. Hammond, however, considers it as equivalent to the phrase, "Those who had betaken themselves to his only service." But if this were the right interpretation, the same rule must be applied to the assertion of St. Paul, that he was

ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, Romans, i. 1. That must mean that he "separated himself to the Gospel of God." Yet who will declare this, despite his own repeated testimony, and the testimony of the inspired historian to the contrary?

Others contend that *τεταγμένοι* is here used as equivalent to *εὐθετοί*. But, if it were allowed that in some cases they may be expressive of a similar idea, it remains for those who assert that they are ever perfectly synonymous to adduce passages as proofs, which they have failed to do. And here it cannot be so. For how can men be "fit for eternal life," before they have believed in Christ? Sir Norton Knatchbull, with yet greater boldness, has endeavoured to prove that *τεταγμένοι* is here put for *συνηγμένοι*. But there are three insuperable objections to this supposition. 1st, No proof is adduced, or can be, that *τάσσω* ever has such a signification. 2d, The *τεταγμένοι* is immediately, is inseparably connected with *εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. And 3d, this clause, as rendered by him, would convert the whole verse into confusion, thus: "And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad and glorified the word of the Lord; and as many as were met together (that is, all the Gentiles,) believed to (or in) eternal life." It is obvious, that if this had been the meaning of the sacred historian, he must, he would naturally, have altogether omitted the words, *οἱ δὲ ἦσαν τεταγμένοι*. These words clearly make a comparison between the multitude of the Gentiles and certain persons among them. And if we take the former part of this verse to refer to those "who, when they heard, received the word with joy, but having no root, fell away;" and the latter to those "who in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, kept it, and brought forth fruit with patience;" the parts are consistent with each other, and are consistent with Scripture generally. Aye, it may be said, this is just the point that proves the practical nature of this text. The Jews had "an evil heart of unbelief," and so rejected the truth; but the Gentiles, having "an honest and good heart," received it—listened to the Gospel, and lived thereby. "And who," I ask, "made them to differ; and what had the Gentiles that they had not received?" Not they themselves—not this right disposition of heart. "Make you a new heart and a new spirit," is indeed the command of God to man. But how? Surely by seeking it from Him who has promised, "A new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." If then this gift is, as every gift must be, "by grace," what can they mean, (apart from the sophistical substitution of different expressions,) who render the words under discussion, "were disposed, that is, disposed themselves?" Who can "dispose to eternal life?" Surely God alone. This is allowed even by Hammond, when contending most strongly against our version here. "Meanwhile it must be remembered," he says at the close of his argument, "that these qualifications are not pretended to have been originally from themselves, but from the preventing grace of

God, to which it is to be acknowledged due, that they ever are pliable or willing to follow Christ, though not to his absolute decree of destining them, whatsoever they do, unto salvation."

Now this is all the concession I care for; although it might have been as candid to have omitted the phrase, "whatsoever they do," as involving another question. I will dispense with the "absolute decree," since the absolute necessity for "preventing grace" is admitted. And what is the natural inference from this admission? Certainly that if this "preventing grace" must precede, and can alone produce the "disposition to eternal life," then that disposition itself must be due to God, not man himself. And if God grants this to some and not to others, as he unquestionably does, he must choose, (on what ground is another question,)—he must choose those to whom he will grant it; since he cannot do what he does not first determine. And those whom he chooses to be the subjects of his saving grace, he must ordain to be the inheritors of his glory. Our text then says rightly, "As many as were ordained to eternal life, believed."

But I must hasten to a conclusion; first, however, quoting the opinion of Doddridge, since his name has been brought into the question. This is his paraphrase of the latter clause of the verse; "And as many of those who were present, as were, through the operation of Divine grace upon their hearts, in good earnest determined for eternal life, and brought to a resolution of courageously facing all opposition in the way to it, believed, and openly embraced the Gospel." And this, I think, clearly shows that he was not among the number of those who contend that the Gentiles of Antioch "disposed themselves to eternal life." Now, I ask, where is the practicalness of this text? I allow that every part of revealed truth may be made practical; but contend that this, in common with many other doctrinal statements, is so in its inferences only, and not in its expression. The original words do but express that which our version literally renders, "And as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed." What lessons can be legitimately drawn from this declaration, or profitably connected with it, remains for the consideration of each interpreter of the sacred Volume; only let them not affix the seal of inspiration to the products of their own imagination.

If, sir, you deem this vindication of a passage which lies at the basis of a great doctrine of Christianity worthy of your readers' attention, you will, by its insertion in your Magazine of truth, give satisfaction to your

UNKNOWN CORRESPONDENT.

NOTES ON CHURCH USAGES.

NO. I.—PUBLIC THANKSGIVING AFTER CHILD-BIRTH.

A PRACTICE prevails now almost universally in our churches of presenting to God public thanksgivings on behalf of those mothers who desire to acknowledge their deliverance from the perils of child-bearing.

As there is reason to fear that this observance is not very clearly understood amongst our people, a few remarks upon its origin and import may not be without its use to many readers.

In the Jewish church, every woman in child-bed was accounted unclean, and was for a prescribed period debarred from the society of her family, and from the tabernacle of God.* Amongst a semi-barbarous people it may be easily imagined that there were physical considerations which required the enactment of such a law, the need of which was felt even by the heathen; so that the Greeks and Romans established analogous usages. In the early Christian churches there was enough of corruption in doctrine, and viciousness in interpretation, to make this physical law appear to sanction the contempt with which marriage was treated, and to insinuate, if not openly to assert, that some moral defilement was connected with the act of child-bearing. Hence we find that all the western rituals, and those of the patriarchate of Constantinople,† contain an office relating to “the purification of women,” which in due course found its way into the English Service Book. That suspicious title, together with the requirements of the Rubric, led our Puritan fathers to say that “the purification, or churching of women after child-birth, is an apish imitation of that old legal ordinance of God in Levit. xii. 1—8, for the purification of women.”‡

This, however, was warmly repelled by Richard Hooker, who replied, “It is but an overflowing of gall which causeth the woman’s absence from church, during her lying-in, to be traduced and interpreted as though she were so long judged unholy, and were thereby shut out, or sequestered from the house of God, according to the ancient Levitical law. Whereas the very canon law itself doth not so hold, but directly the contrary.”§

This may be very true, but certainly the church in this, as in most other things, has mystified and perplexed the matter so, that it may be very easily misunderstood. “The Purification of St. Mary” is observed by the Church of England; and Brady says, “From her pious submission to

* Leviticus, xii, 1—8. This question is considered in Michaelis’s Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, book iv. chap. 4, part 2, art. 214, vol. iii. p. 315.

† Palmer’s Origines Liturgicæ, &c. vol. ii. p. 258.

‡ Samuel Mather’s Types of the Old Testament, 4to ed., p. 286.

§ Ecclesiastical Polity, book v. sec. 74.

the law arose the present religious rite of *churching* in this country after child-birth.*

The requirement also that the woman should be "decently apparelled," which church authority has determined to mean being "*covered with a white veil*,"* like a token of shame, as if some folly had been committed—that she shall "kneel near the place where the *holy* table stands," to which special sanctity is attached—that she "must offer accustomed offerings,"—all these must suggest to an ill-informed person, that she is passing under some spiritual lustration, and that she will return from her "churching" more pure than she went to it.

The Puritans also objected, that the forms prescribed by the Church of England were not suitable; and there was sufficient force in this objection to compel an alteration.

Before the Act of Uniformity, the 121st psalm was appointed to be read in "the thanksgiving of women after child-birth," the sixth verse of which in the old version reads, "So that the sun shall not burn thee by day, nor the moon by night:" this John Milton classed "with impertinencies"—"those thanks in the woman's churching, for her delivery from sun-burning, and moon-blasting, as if she had been travelling, not in her bed, but in the deserts of Arabia."

The 116th or 117th Psalm is now used, but still out of the old version, so that Samuel Mather remarked, "In the Book of Common Prayer they have omitted some gross things, but retain the title, 'Churching of Women,' and order the woman 'to speak in the church,' and say the 116th or 117th Psalm, wherein they leave the good and sound translation which we have in our Bibles, and follow a corrupt one, wherein they make the woman talk of giving a reward to the Lord: and moreover they appoint absurd broken responds, and tossings of their prayers, like tennis balls, as is common with them in other their offices."† The justice of this oft-repeated satire was felt by Bishop Sparrow, who vindicates the usage as "the remains of a very ancient custom. What the reason of it was, I will not peremptorily determine."‡

Cartwright also urged that there was no occasion for a solemn and express giving of thanks for this more than for other and greater mercies, which, if presented on behalf of every individual, would leave no time for other duties of public worship.§

In this objection modern Nonconformists do not generally sympathize. They regard the deliverance wrought to be a special one, for alas, not a few perish in their sorrows; and as requiring public acknowledgments, seeing that the birth of a man-child into the world is necessa-

* Burns' Ecclesiastical Law, art. Child-birth.

† Types of the Old Testament, 4to, 286.

‡ Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer, p. 231.

§ A Reply, &c. p. 151.

rily connected with the interests of society, and the church of God. Hence there may be very frequently heard in our places of worship thanksgivings for this deliverance. As, however, we separate ourselves from the ritual of the established church, it is our peculiar duty to see that all the observances we practise are free from that uninformed, if not superstitious state of mind, which we suspect prevails with very many who go to be "churched." We would respectfully ask, whether there is not, on the face of many of the notes sent to dissenting pulpits for public acknowledgments, such indications of ignorance, as to excite the suspicion that the party is not about to perform an intelligent service, but is conforming to a custom strenuously enforced by monthly nurses, and performed at chapel rather than at church, in order to escape from "*the accustomed offerings?*" It is worthy of consideration, therefore, whether it would not be well to prepare a perspicuous tract, to be addressed to mothers in such circumstances, who should be requested to read the same before public expressions of thanksgiving be offered on behalf of persons, of whose state of heart and conduct the preacher knows nothing. In all cases the parties should be required to add their names * and addresses, that the pastor may recal the character of the party, or if they be strangers to him, that he may employ in prayer phraseology not likely to mislead. The Rev. Job Orton has remarked, in a letter to a young clergyman, that in prayer for others, "even common appellations, as *thy servant, thy handmaid*, may, in some cases do harm, as you know, and will know, how prone persons are to catch at any shadow of hope, without penitence and faith." It is the happiness of our churches that we are not bound to observe and perpetuate usages that are but little understood, and easily perverted.

B.

CORRESPONDENCE ON THE CLAIMS TO LADY HEWLEY'S CHARITY.

THE REV. RICHARD HUNTER IN REPLY TO VERUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

SIR,—On opening the December supplement to the Congregational Magazine, which was yesterday put into my hands, I found a lengthened article, entitled, "Scotch Presbyterian Claims to Lady Hewley's Charity." As the writer has withheld his name, and as the most of his arguments, especially with regard to the hollow and ephemeral "union of 1691,"

* The writer believes it is usual in the Wesleyan Methodist connexion, for the preacher, before he commences prayer, to read aloud all the notes requesting intercession or thanksgiving. He remembers to have heard the venerable Joseph Benson, on one occasion, read, "A woman desires to return thanks to Almighty God for safe delivery, &c., but she is ashamed of her name!"

have been elsewhere repeatedly refuted, I consider it a waste of time to attempt to pursue him through all the sophistries by which he labours to show that Lady Hewley and her Presbyterian contemporaries were not what they hypocritically professed to be, but real and zealous Independents. But, as he has ungenerously endeavoured to convict myself and two of my Presbyterian brethren of a wilful perversion of historical truth, it would be injustice to ourselves, were I to allow his lucubrations to pass altogether unnoticed. Allow me, however, to assure him, that I am not less averse to magazine controversy than to Chancery litigation; and that it is to me a matter of deep regret, that the Independent representatives—with whose determinations he seems to be thoroughly acquainted—are as indisposed as ever to cultivate towards the Presbyterian claimants the things which make for peace.

I. The first charge brought against the Presbyterian representatives in the Hewley suit is, "their bold and reiterated assertion, that Lady Hewley, at the time of founding the charity, belonged to the body called Presbyterians."* If this be a bold assertion, it is made on the authority of Drake, the York historian, who affirmed that "Lady Hewley died a Presbyterian." If it be a bold assertion, it is made on the unexceptionable testimony of one of the Independent deponents—Dr. James Bennett, who at the commencement of this suit declared, that "there is a pew in St. Saviour's Gate Chapel, York, commonly reported and considered to be the pew formerly occupied by Lady Hewley; that Dr. Coulton and Mr. Hotham were the first preachers at said chapel, and that they were of the denomination called Presbyterian."† And finally, if it be a bold assertion, it is made on the authority of the present lord high chancellor, who, in his decision against the Unitarians, in 1836, thus expressed himself:—"There can be no doubt," said he, "that Lady Hewley was, in her religious faith and opinions, a Presbyterian. It is a matter of history that she was so. It is proved that she attended the chapel which she herself built and endowed—St. Saviour's Gate Chapel, and which is admitted to have been a Presbyterian chapel. Dr. Coulton, the preacher at that chapel, was an acknowledged Presbyterian. He was her religious adviser. He was executor to her will. He preached her funeral sermon. All these circumstances lead satisfactorily to the conclusion, that she was in her opinions a Presbyterian."‡

II. A second charge brought against both sets of Presbyterian claimants is, "that they rigidly adhere to the standards of the Westminster

* See Congregational Magazine for December, p. 934.

† See Appendix to Appellants' Case in the House of Lords, between Samuel Shore, Esq. and others, appellants; and Thomas Wilson, Esq. and others, respondents.—p. 106.

‡ See Lord Lyndhurst's Decision against the Unitarians, published by his lordship's permission. 1836.—p. 20.

Assembly, which they say were the standards of the old English Presbyterians." Baxter is acknowledged by Mr. Joshua Wilson—a gentleman closely connected with the relators in this suit—to have taken "a prominent part in the affairs of the Presbyterian body;" and, as one of the most distinguished representatives of the old English Presbyterians, his sentiments are entitled to the utmost respect. In Baxter's Narrative of his own Life and Times we meet with these remarkable words: "I have perused oft the Confession of the Assembly, and verily judge it the most excellent for fulness and exactness that I have ever read from any church; and, though some few points in it are beyond my reach, yet I have observed nothing in it contrary to my judgment."* Such was the estimate formed by this "prominent" Presbyterian leader, of the merits of the old English Presbyterian standards. They continued to be regarded with veneration by his immediate successors in the Presbyterian ministry. Dr. Edmund Calamy, and all his Presbyterian contemporaries, were ordained "according to the Directory of the Westminster Assembly."† And in a letter published by the Doctor in 1717, that is, seven years after Lady Hewley's death, he expressly states that his brethren "generally agree to the Confession of Faith and larger and smaller Catechisms compiled by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster."‡ But I need not go so far to show that this was the case. The fact is elsewhere admitted by an historian well-known to our anonymous assailant. In 1835, Mr. Joshua Wilson published a work entitled, "An Historical Inquiry concerning the Principles, &c. of the English Presbyterians;" and in remonstrating with a learned Unitarian apologist, he very properly challenges him to prove that—during the Hewley era—the successors of the Westminster divines had ever "rescinded or revoked the standards of the original English Presbyterians." Nor is this all. In the same page, Mr. Wilson denounced the Rev. Joseph Hunter, and the nominal Presbyterians with whom he contended, "for having relinquished their original standard—the standard adopted by the founders of the Presbyterian churches, who, during the period in question, and for many years after, adhered to the same standard, and generally believed the doctrines which it contained."‡ If further evidence be wanting, at page 23, we find Mr. Wilson—in full confidence of its correctness—reiterating the statement that "the Presbyterian divines, after the Restoration, still adhered to the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of *their* Assembly, and professed the doctrines contained in them." And that there may be no defect whatever, in the proof that the standards of the Westminster Assembly continued to be regarded with undiminished affection by the Presbyterians of the Hewley period itself, Mr. Wilson triumphantly asks, "May I

* Folio edition, part i. p. 21.

† See evidence of Dr. J. Pye Smith, in Appendix to Appellants' Case.—p. 102.

‡ Historical Inquiry, &c. by Joshua Wilson, Esq.—p. 18.

not safely affirm that, up to the *very end of the seventeenth century*, there is no evidence of *any* degree of doctrinal relaxation, among the English Presbyterians, from their *original standard*, the Confession and Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly?"—p. 118.

III. Another charge is that, "in a long affidavit by three ministers of the Secession, they have the hardihood to state it as a fact, that the ejected ministers were all members of the Presbyterian establishment." That Presbyterianism was really established in England, for several years previous to the restoration of the second Charles, no one at all acquainted with the ecclesiastical history of the period had for a moment presumed to doubt. The unsettled circumstances of the times, indeed, had prevented some of its details from being carried into complete operation; but it is a matter of public record that the two Houses of Parliament actually sanctioned the gradual organization of the Presbyterian polity, as contradistinguished from Diocesan Episcopacy on the one hand, and from Independency on the other. "On the 5th of June, 1646, they passed an ordinance for the present settling, without further delay, of the presbyterial government in the Church of England; on the 28th of August, 1646, an ordinance for the ordination of ministers by classical presbyters; on the 29th of January, 1647, an ordinance for the speedy dividing and settling the several counties of the kingdom into distinct classical presbyteries and congregational elderships; and on the 22d April of the same year, remedies for removing some obstructions in church government."* Neal, in his *History of the Puritans*, states expressly that, in 1653, "the Presbyterians had their monthly or quarterly classical presbyteries in every county, for the ordination of ministers by imposition of hands, according to the Directory."† The same pains-taking historian afterwards affirms that, in 1659, "the Presbyterians were in possession of the whole power of England; their clergy were in possession of the universities and of the best livings in the kingdom; there was hardly an Episcopalian in any post of honour or trust; the whole government was with the Presbyterians, who were shy of the Independents."‡ And with equal regard to truth, he subsequently adds, that "the Independents dissented from the establishment,"§ and probably rejoiced in the prospect of its downfall. After these quotations, which might have been multiplied to an indefinite extent, I cannot believe that "the Secession ministers" were guilty of any "hardihood" of assertion in maintaining as historical facts, that Presbyterianism, at the period

* See Abridgment of "Baxter's History of his Life and Times." London, 1713. pp. 85, 86.

† See "History of the Puritans," by Daniel Neal, M.A. London, 1822. Vol. iv. p. 74.

‡ Vol. iv. p. 224.

§ Vol. iv. p. 280.

referred to, was the established religion of England, and that the ministers ejected by the Uniformity Act of 1662 were professedly Presbyterians.

IV. But in supporting a position which cannot be reasonably contested, we are accused of attempting to verify our statement "by a false quotation from Calamy's Abridgment of the Life of Baxter." The alleged misquotation is as follows: "Calamy says, their attachment to Presbytery was demonstrated by nearly two thousand of their ministers suffering themselves to be ejected, rather than invalidate their Presbyterian ordination." For the information of the more candid of the readers of the Congregational Magazine, it may be sufficient to state, that the words supposed to be ascribed to Calamy are taken from a printed volume, containing the various Chancery affidavits filed in the master's office; and that as it was published without our sanction, and not subjected to our revision in its progress through the press, we ought not to be condemned as responsible for the many typographical mistakes with which it abounds.* But be this as it may, the truth of the facts represented as taken from Calamy's Abridgment admits of no dispute. It cannot be denied on the authority of the very historian, whom we are harshly vilified for misquoting, "that those called Presbyterians were forced to do that which they accounted perjury, or be cast out of office in the church . . . that they did not throw themselves out of service, but were forcibly ejected. . . . and that they were not a poor inconsiderable handful. . . . but two thousand preaching ministers who were unwearied in their endeavours to spread knowledge, faith, and holiness."† Nor can it be denied that they suffered themselves to be thrust out, "*rather than invalidate their Presbyterian ordination.*" On this point, my Presbyterian associates and I did not make a random asseveration; but, in reference to the grounds of their refusal to submit to Episcopal domination, we knew well whereof we affirmed. In Calamy's Abridgment, sundry reasons are assigned; but that we are utterly guiltless of the heinous charge of misrepresenting the historian's meaning, it may be sufficient to convince the most incredulous, if I quote the following passages. "To put the matter beyond all dispute," says Calamy, "an express *renunciation* of their *foregoing ordination by presbyters* was required before Episcopal ordination could be had." And again, he states in language which is not susceptible of any evasion, that "being convinced that the requiring them to be Episcopally ordained, who had been in a re-

* The title of the volume is, "The Third Act of the Controversy pending in the High Court of Chancery, in the cause of the Attorney General v. Shore, being the proceedings before the master to determine the proper parties to be trustees in the place of those removed." London; Green, Newgate Street, 1837.

† Calamy's Abridgment, pp. 182, 184, 185.

gular way ordained by presbyters before, tended to *nullify* their past orders, and *invalidate* their consequent ministrations, they durst not submit to it."—pp. 198, 199.

V. Nor is it fair to condemn us for boldly denying that those venerable men were inimical to Presbytery, because they expressed their readiness to acquiesce in a slightly modified system of ecclesiastical polity. Archbishop Usher's plan, which Calamy tells us "the Presbyterian ministers, in 1660, presented to the king,"* was essentially Presbyterian. The presidents whom he allowed were merely *primi inter pares*; they were functionaries chosen by the presbyters, accountable to the presbyters, and liable to be displaced by the presbyters. The plan is designated by Calamy, "the reduction of Episcopacy into the form of synodical government received in the ancient church."† The presidents or bishops referred to, held precisely the same place which the moderators of presbyteries and synods do, who are, for the time of their appointment, the bishops of the presbyteries or synods to which they respectively belong. This was neither more nor less than the primitive Episcopacy, which the Presbyterian ministers were willing to accept. Calamy says, "They were all branded as *rigid Presbyterians*, though they never put up one petition for Presbytery, but pleaded for primitive Episcopacy."‡ Like reasonable men, they were willing to give up the then odious name, if they could obtain the reality; and on this account, they did not, in their conference at the Savoy with the Episcopal party, plead for the very word, but, without the smallest sacrifice of principle, sought peace, with exemplary consistency. But no portion of their recorded proceedings implies, that they at all relinquished their preference of Presbytery. Before concluding my remarks on this subject, I deem it important to advert to the fact that in Calamy's account of Usher's scheme, notes on the margin state that the "parochial government" therein recommended, "was answerable to the church session in Scotland;" "that the monthly synods were answerable to the Scottish presbytery; and that the diocesan and national synods were answerable to the provincial synods and to the general assembly in Scotland."§ Allow me to ask, would the Independents of the present day submit to Usher's scheme? They could not do so, without renouncing their denominational principles. If Verus was not ignorant of these things, when he wrote the anonymous article on which I have been animadverting, I know not how he can escape the suspicion of designing to mislead, by partial and equivocal statements.

VI. The only other charge at which I have at present leisure to remark, is, "that the repeated assertions of the (Presbyterian) deponents concerning themselves, completely disprove their own case and refute

* Ib. p. 144. † Ib. p. 145. ‡ Ib. p. 177. § Ib. pp. 147, 148, 149.

their *audacious* claims."* On this point, I am in some measure left to vague conjecture, as Verus has not condescended to specify wherein the audacity of our egotism consists; but if offence have been given to any of our Independent brethren, by our reiterated declarations of attachment to what Mr. Wilson describes, as "the original standard among the English Presbyterians, up to the very end of the seventeenth century," we have the satisfaction to know that in doing so, we honestly asserted our matured convictions, and that our own consciences condemn us not.

Or, was it *audacious* to assert that the form of church government, which we prefer to Congregationalism or Independency, could not justly be regarded as *exclusively Scotch*? Had we ventured to hazard an affirmation so preposterous as the contrary assertion would have indicated, we could not have successfully rebutted a charge which Verus has uncharitably hurled against us—that of "boldness and assurance, in swearing history."† But the ecclesiastical annals of the seventeenth century tell us that our favourite polity was promulgated to the English population, not by a Scotch, but by an English synod, the Westminster Assembly; nor can we discover any audacity in swearing that its subsequent adoption by the church and people of Scotland did not invalidate its English origin.

Or finally, were we audacious in asserting that the term "Scotch Presbyterian" is inapplicable to the classes whom the Presbyterian "deponents" represent? If there be any audacity in this, we plead guilty to the charge. It cannot be denied that our congregations are *English by locality*, and that they embrace as large a proportion of natives of England, as many Independent congregations. It is well known that the mixture of numerous native Irish, in almost all the Roman Catholic congregations in England, does not in the least degree affect their legal status, as English Roman Catholics. Nor could any man of sound understanding believe that Highbury College has forfeited its title to be recognized as an English Congregational or Independent institution, because its highly respectable head—Dr. Henderson, and some of its pupils, happened to be born on the north side of the Tweed.

I have merely time to add that, if regard to the interests of justice induce you to insert the preceding observations, I may probably trouble you with some further remarks on the communication of Verus.

I am, Mr. Editor, yours respectfully,

RICHARD HUNTER.

Carlisle, 10th December, 1842.

* Congregational Magazine for December, p. 949.

† *Ib.* p. 942.

REPLY OF "VERUS" TO THE REV. RICHARD HUNTER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

SIR,—I am obliged by your handing to me the Rev. Richard Hunter's reply to the communication inserted in your late Supplement concerning the Scotch Presbyterian claims to Lady Hewley's charity. I am glad to learn that you have decided to insert it, and request that the following brief and hastily written remarks may be appended to it in your January number.

If my arguments are mere "sophistries," let them be *refuted*, not dismissed as "lucubrations" unworthy of notice. I trust that I may with sincerity avow myself a lover of truth. If through ignorance or misinformation I have made any false statement, I am willing to be corrected—if I have used any unduly harsh language, I am willing to retract it—but if my historical allegations are, as I believe them to be, according to the real facts, I will maintain and defend them. I must, however, disclaim having charged these parties with "a wilful perversion of historical truth." The true explanation I believe to be this—the word *Presbyterian* deceived them—they acted with precipitation, and in their eagerness to obtain a valuable prize did not allow themselves sufficient time for patient investigation and calm deliberate thought. This I am sure is the most charitable construction that can be put upon their conduct.

I. In stating what he calls my "first charge," Mr. H. does not give the whole sentence in which it is contained, but stops short at a comma, and before he reaches the important words printed in italics.* The effect of this disingenuous proceeding is to represent me as denying what I have not denied—that Lady Hewley, at the time of founding her charities, belonged to the body called *Presbyterian*. Instead of describing *this* as a bold assertion, I have proceeded throughout my "lucubrations" on the supposition that such was the fact. I have not said, indeed, as Mr. H. alleges, or at least insinuates, that she was "a zealous Independent," but have assumed that she belonged to a body who were "called Presbyterians," while in fact substantially Congregational, as contra-distinguished from Scottish Presbyterians; or, to adopt Dr. Bennett's words, that she was "of the denomination called Presbyterian," as it existed in England during the reign of Queen Anne.

II. In reference to the second charge—I fully agree in what Mr. H. says and quotes concerning Baxter as "a prominent leader in the affairs of the Presbyterian body," as "one of the most distinguished representatives of the old English Presbyterians." I admit that "his sentiments are entitled to the utmost respect;" but what he says in

* Congregational Magazine, December, 1842, p. 934.

the passage quoted, concerning the Assembly's Confession, clearly refers to the *doctrinal* portion only.* I also freely admit that Dr. Calamy's testimony in 1717, produced by Mr. H., is true, that his brethren "generally agreed to the Confession of Faith, and larger and smaller Catechisms compiled by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster." As Mr. Hunter quotes with approbation some passages from an Historical Inquiry published in 1835, all which passages refer exclusively to *doctrinal* standards, I may be permitted to extract from that work a passage in which Baxter, after professing his *general* assent to the Westminster and other similar documents, adds—"For the Confession of our Assembly, yea, or the larger Catechism, without some correction, I do hereby protest my dissent against the so imposing them to a word, upon all ministers, that no man that cannot subscribe to them shall be permitted in the church." Again—"But before any forms be tendered to us to subscribe, we must have them reduced into a narrower room, and into phrase so clearly rational or scriptural, as no sober, studious, competent, godly divine shall scruple. Call it Socinian, or what name soever imperious faction shall put upon it, yet tender consciences will expect this, and the churches shall never have peace in any other way, unless I be a false prophet; and the contrary course doth but tend to do the same in doctrine, as the Common Prayer Book did in worship; even to ensnare the most conscientious and work them out of the ministry by degrees, and to create us a lazy formal ministry, that will take all upon trust and run to the authority of their Confession instead of their Bible."†

Hence it appears that, while the English Presbyterians, of whom Baxter was the leader and representative, adhered in substance to these standards, they did not servilely adopt every particular mode of expression, or rigidly adhere to the exact phraseology, as do the Scottish Presbyterians. This practice of the latter has been most emphatically and distinctly affirmed by both sets of claimants, who expressly declare that "no man who cannot *subscribe* to them is permitted" to officiate as a minister "in *their* church."

All the passages quoted from the Historical Inquiry relate to the Westminster documents as *doctrinal* standards. Indeed the author's only design evidently was to prove the orthodoxy of the English Presbyterian founders in matters of doctrine. But immediately after

* Mr. H.'s reference is to the Narrative of his Life, part i. p. 21, but the passage is not to be found there. The *unmutilated* sentence, taken from Baxter's "Confession of his Faith," may be found in Wilson's Historical Inquiry, p. 11. The following words are omitted by Mr. H.—"and though the truths therein being of several degrees of evidence and necessity, I do not hold them with equal clearness, confidence, or certainty,—"

† Second Edition, 1836, pp. 13, 14.

stating that the English Presbyterians of a later period "generally believed the *doctrines* contained in the original standards of faith of their predecessors," he proceeds to deny that they imposed them as tests, or required *subscription* to them—as the Scotch Presbyterians in England invariably do.*

III. In reference to the alleged fact that the ministers ejected in 1662 were "all professedly Presbyterians," and "members of the Presbyterian Establishment"—Dr. Calamy expressly mentions concerning many of them, that they were "Congregational in their judgment;" and yet these were in possession of livings, and ejected from them equally with the professed Presbyterians. This proves that uniformity in matters of church discipline was not enforced, and in fact did not exist. In one of Mr. H.'s extracts from Neal, that writer says that in 1659 "the Presbyterian clergy were in possession of the universities, and of the *best* livings in the kingdom;" but that surely will not prove that *all* who were in possession of livings were Presbyterian clergy. As to the universities, the statement of Neal, though generally accurate, is not strictly correct, for Dr. Calamy informs us that Dr. Goodwin, who had been made president of Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1649, and had there formed a church upon the Independent plan, held that office till after the Restoration. Mr. Thankful Owen, president of St. John's, and Mr. Thomas Cole, principal of St. Mary's Hall, were not ejected from their offices till 1660. Probably there were other Independent ministers who continued heads of houses in that university, and I believe the same might be said as to Cambridge.

Mr. H. asserts as an unquestionable fact, that "for several years previous to the restoration of Charles II., Presbyterianism was really established in England." Of course he must be understood to mean what he considers the true and proper system of Presbyterian church government. Without entering fully into this question at present, I may produce the following extracts as evidence in confirmation of my original statement.

"The Savoy Declaration [the confession of the Congregational churches in 1658] contains the same views of Christian doctrine with the Westminster Confession, but omits those parts of it which relate to the power of Synods, church censures, marriage, and divorce, and the authority of the civil magistrate in matters purely religious, *and which were never ratified by Parliament.*"†

* Historical Inquiry, pp. 18—20.

† Orme's Memoirs of Dr. Owen, p. 233. Mr. Orme adds in a note, the following extract from the preface to the Savoy Declaration: "We rather give this notice because that copy of the parliament's followed by us is in few men's hands; the other, as it came from the Assembly, being approved of in Scotland, was printed and hastened into the world, before the parliament had declared their resolutions about it; and yet hath been and continueth to be the copy ordinarily only sold, printed, and reprinted for these eleven years."

" 1660. The house, thus enlarged, became entirely Presbyterian The Presbyterians being now again in the saddle, a day of thanksgiving was kept, after which the city ministers petitioned for the redress of sundry grievances. They requested the house to establish the Assembly's Confession of Faith, Directory, and Catechisms, &c. In answer to these requests, the house agreed to a bill, March 2, for approbation of public ministers according to the Directory, and named Mr. Manton, and several others of the Presbyterian persuasion, for that service; which passed into an act, March 14. They declared for the Assembly's Confession of Faith, *except the thirtieth and thirty-first chapters of discipline*, and appointed a committee to prepare an act declaring it to be the public confession of faith of the church of England. The act passed the house, March 5, and was ordered to be printed; Dr. Reynolds, Mr. Manton, and Mr. Calamy to have the care of the press. On the same day they ordered the solemn league and covenant to be reprinted, and set up in every church in England, and read publicly by the minister once every year. Thus, (immediately adds the historian,) Presbytery was restored to all the power it had ever enjoyed."*

IV. As to the alleged false quotation, Mr. H.'s vindication of himself and his brethren appears to me most unsatisfactory. He says the words are taken from the printed volume published without their sanction, and abounding in typographical mistakes. But does he mean to state that the whole passage distinctly ascribing these words to Dr. Calamy is a typographical mistake? This cannot with any shadow of plausibility be pretended, nor can I see how it was possible for the words to be taken from the printed volume, when that volume was not printed till all the affidavits had been sworn and filed, and indeed contains the very affidavit in which this passage occurs. The other passages produced by Mr. H. to sustain the truth of the misquoted sentence do not at all affect the real question in dispute, the maintenance of ordination by presbyters not being a tenet peculiar to Presbyterians, but held in common by moderate, and I believe by all modern Independents. In the sense of opposing prelatical usurpation, and contending for the validity of ordinations by presbyters, modern Congregationalists are as much entitled to be called Presbyterians as the most thorough-going Scotch disciplinarians; for they equally "refuse to submit to Episcopal domination." If this, therefore, was all the *Presbytery* to which the ejected ministers professedly Presbyterian were attached, and for which they contended, the present race of Independents are precisely *such* Presbyterians.

V. As to Archbishop Usher's model, Baxter evidently did not consider it "essentially Presbyterian"—"a slightly modified system of ecclesiastical polity," but a system widely differing from the *jure divino*

* Neal's History of the Puritans. Edit. 1822, vol. iv. pp. 205, 206.

Presbyterianism of the Assembly. Neal says, "The Scots Kirk stood to their principles, and would have bid defiance to the old clergy, but Mr. Calamy, Manton, and Ash, informed them in the name of the London ministers, that the general stream and current being for the old prelacy in its pomp and height, it was in vain to hope for *establishing Presbytery*, which made them lay aside the thoughts of it, and fly to Archbishop Usher's moderate Episcopacy."* This modified system, therefore, whatever it was, must have been quite another thing from the rigid unmitigated system of the Westminster Assembly, for which the zealots of Scots Presbytery had so fiercely contended. Dr. Vaughan, speaking of this period, says, "Clarendon describes the Presbyterians 'as contending, with their usual confidence,' for the settlement of THEIR DISCIPLINE by 'supreme authority according to the Covenant;' a statement singularly at variance with truth."† I trust I have now cleared myself from "the suspicion of designing to mislead by partial and equivocal statements" in reference to this matter.

In conclusion, I leave every reader to decide for himself whether the claims set up are justly described as *audacious*. If that be not an appropriate term, fully justified by the circumstances of the case, I am willing to substitute "*modest*," "*reasonable*," or whatever other word may be considered more suitable.

I must contend that the parties represented by these claimants, although resident in England, are properly designated *Scotch* Presbyterians, whether born in Scotland or not, inasmuch as what Mr. H. calls "our favourite polity," is the Scottish system of church government and discipline first introduced into England by Scots zealots, promulgated indeed by an English synod, the Westminster Assembly, but not established in England by the authority of law, on the basis of that covenanted and absolute uniformity for which its fierce champions contended—a system neither adopted nor approved by the English Presbyterians of a later date, who from the Revolution of 1688, the true founders' era, were a widely different race, "little differing from the moderate Independents," with whom a few years after they formed not a "hollow and ephemeral," but a sincere and permanent union.‡

I have only to remark, in conclusion, that I sympathize with Mr. Hunter in his dislike of litigation and controversy, but he must allow me to remind him that it was not by the Independents that these were commenced in reference to their Scottish brethren, with whom, and with all other Christian communities, I hope and believe

* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv. pp. 226, 227.

† History of England under the House of Stuart, part ii. p. 590, note.

‡ The distinction between English and Scotch Presbyterians in England, is not one invented to serve a particular purpose, but has been continually made by historical writers.

we are sincerely desirous to cultivate the things that make for peace, and tend to mutual edification and improvement. Let me assure him that I am prepared to unite with him in the prayer, that the Supreme Disposer may so guide the decision of the court before which the case will now be speedily brought, that it may "execute justice and maintain truth."

Happily the case is before a British tribunal. We do not live in a country where "truth is fallen, and equity cannot enter." I doubt not that the God of equity and truth will maintain, as he has hitherto maintained, what I conscientiously believe to be "*our* righteous cause." Trusting that your readers will not consider me justly chargeable with having said anything inconsistent with the character of a true witness,

I again subscribe myself, yours respectfully,

VERUS.

December 17th, 1842.

AN ACT OF JUSTICE TO DR. MALTBY, BISHOP OF DURHAM.

IN a review of Dr. Whately's "Kingdom of Christ Delineated," &c., which was inserted in this periodical for July last (p. 475), the following paragraph occurs :—

"That church where the Bishop of London thunders in our ears the doctrines of baptismal regeneration, apostolical succession, and the divine right of episcopacy, and where, at the same moment, his bland and gentle brother of Durham describes dissenting ministers as 'motley and mongrel predicants, centaurs in the church, half clerics and half laics, the by-blows of the clergy, unordained, unblessed, untried, unclean spirits, whose calling, commission, and tenure, depends on popularity, flattery, and beggary; whose excellency consists in tautologizing and praying extempore, that is out of all time, restraint, order, or method, being eminent in nothing above the plebeian pitch and vulgar proportion.' This, and a great deal more in the same elegant style and Christian meekness of spirit, we have *ex cathedra* from this 'prince and prelate,' in his sermon on 'Itinerant Preachers and Haranguers in Private Houses.'"

When the manuscript of this review came into our hands, we thought this a strange passage; but remembering that Dr. Maltby had allowed himself to publish some tart things against Evangelical preachers, and also observing that our reviewer's reference was to a particular sermon, we did not for a moment question the accuracy of the quotation, and inserted the article accordingly.

Edward Dawson, Esq., of Lancaster, and the Rev. G. Balderston Kidd, of Scarborough, however, called our attention to this paragraph, and assuring us that we had been greatly misled, we determined not to

trust in *second-hand* authority, but to ascertain the facts by a reference to the volume in question.

On examining it, our first surprise was to find that this paragraph had not been published "*at the same moment*," with the Bishop of London's Sermons "On the Church," but more than twenty-two years ago, in a volume entitled, "Sermons by Edward Maltby, D.D., vol. i., 1819," long before Dr. Maltby was a bishop or was likely to be made one, and therefore not delivered *ex cathedra* at all.

Our next annoyance was occasioned by the discovery that the sermons in this volume are without titles, and consequently that there is no discourse "On Itinerant Preachers and Haranguers in Private Houses."

We found, however, on closer inspection, that these words occur in the twenty-third sermon, on 1 Thess. ii. 3, 4, "For our exhortation," &c. The leading point of the preacher is to show, that if the ministry of the apostles was, in their own age, personally attacked and contumeliously reviled by ignorant and silly men, it cannot, therefore, be a subject of wonder that increasing opposition should now be made to the ministers of the Gospel who are placed by authority in the church of Christ.

"Be it observed," the doctor adds, "that I am not speaking of dissenters in general, but of those who, having been educated in the bosom of the church, desert it upon the plea that they cannot have the Gospel expounded there faithfully." He then proceeds to state that the true nature of the Gospel must be determined by an appeal to the original Scriptures, and asks the question which party is likely to execute such an undertaking the best? "The seceders from the church and itinerant preachers; expounders of the word of God as unauthorized as they are unqualified, being most of them persons of little or no education, and utterly unacquainted with the learned languages; or those who have been trained up from their earliest youth," &c.—p. 475.

At the end of the volume there are more than forty pages of "Notes and Collections," learned, curious, and instructive; at page 547 the following note occurs upon the passage just quoted:—p. 475, l. 4.

"*Itinerant preachers; haranguers in private houses.*

"I lately saw an extract from an old pamphlet, entitled 'A Brief Description or Character of the Religion and Manners of true Phantiques in general, scil. Anabaptists, Independents, Brownists, Enthusiasts, Levellers, Quakers, Seekers, Fifth Monarchy Men, and Dippers, showing and refuting their Absurdities, by due Application; reflecting much also on Sir John Præcisian, and other Novelists. *Non seria semper.* London: printed and are to be sold by most stationers, 1660.' This passage I lay before my readers as a very curious specimen of the language of controversy, at the time of the Restoration:—

" 'They are motley and mongrel *predicants*, centaurs in the church, half clerics and half laics, the by-blows of the clergy, gifted hypocrites, severe *momuses*, a whining people, *tribolary* Christians, new dwindling divines, the prophetic *pigmies* of this age, unordained, unblest, untried, unclean spirits, whose calling, commission, and tenure, depends on popularity, flattery, and beggary; their excellency consists in *tautologizing*, in praying *extempore*, that is, out of all time, without order or method, being eminent in nothing above the *plebeian* pitch and vulgar proportion. They spin out their sermons at their wheels, or weave them up at their looms, or dig them out with their spades, weigh or measure them in their shops, or stitch and cobble them with their thimble and lasts; or thresh them out with their flails, and afterward preach them in their barns to their dusty disciples, who, the better to set off the oddness of their silly teachers, fancy themselves into some imaginary persecution, as if they were driven into dens, and caves, and woods. Their holy and learned academics, where they first conned this chemical new divinity, and are since come to so great proficiency, were *Munster's Revelations*, *Geneva's Calvinism*, *Amsterdam's Toleration*, and *New England's Preciseness*.' "—p. 548.

Now, although the passage to which this note is appended was not very courteous toward itinerant preachers, and the quotation was made, as it seems to us, to illustrate, if not to confirm, the text, still it was "too bad" to attribute it to Dr. Maltby's pen, and to make him alike answerable for the style and the sentiment. As our reviewer's citation thus signally failed of proof, our readers will be impatient to know how this mistake could occur. They may be assured that it is truly humiliating to our editorial dignity, and very perilous to that infallibility which multitudes still attribute to the oracular "we," for us to tell a plain unvarnished tale, not only of the manner in which our gifted reviewer was misled, but how another brother of our gentle craft was misled also.

In *The Christian Examiner* for May last, there appeared the following paragraph:—

"A PRELATIC DESCRIPTION OF DISSENTING MINISTERS.

"We often admire what we cannot imitate. Especially is this true in the literary department. We give an illustration. We have recently met with the following graphic description of Nonconforming ministers, and we confess ourselves totally unable to imitate its beauty and its power. Nor can we be greatly humbled when we make this confession—for, who is the author? Not a Nonconforming presbyter like ourselves, but a profoundly learned, a right reverend prelate of the first order! A prince and a prelate! No less a personage than the Right Reverend Father in God, Dr. MALTBY, the Bishop of Durham. In his sermon on 'Itinerant Preachers and Haranguers in Private Houses,' he, the meek and mild successor of the apostles, beautifully introduces the following admirable scholium."

Here occurs the passage already quoted.

"Read this, ye dissenting ministers of the empire, and say, if this description of your character, attainments, pursuits, and habits, has ever been surpassed! The classic elegance of the style is only equalled by the Christian meekness of the spirit!"

This extract, it appears, met our reviewer's eye, and he, "good easy man," relying on the fidelity of his literary brother, penned the unhappy passage for which we have now to apologize. Should our readers inquire again, what the editor of the *Christian Examiner* can say to this, we have to state, that his attention has been called to it, as well as ours, and that, in his number for December, the following apologetical passage appears.

"THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

"It is our fixed purpose never intentionally to do injustice to any man in conducting this journal, and hence the following explanation. We were furnished, some months ago, by an intelligent correspondent, with extracts from a review of Sermons by the present Bishop of Durham, in which extracts, curious epithets were applied to dissenting ministers. The impression produced by this statement, as furnished to us, and by us, would be, either that Dr. Maltby had applied these offensive epithets to dissenting ministers, or that he had quoted them with approbation. We find that in either case the impression would be erroneous—that instead of using these epithets in his Sermons, the Bishop only quotes them in a 'note,' as a specimen of the way in which former churchmen had been wont to vilify dissenting ministers. The language thereof is a proof of the bigotry and intolerance of some churchmen, but not of the present Bishop of Durham. We have sincere pleasure in voluntarily offering this explanation; our regret that, through inadvertence on the part of a friend just as incapable as we are of intentionally misrepresenting any man, we fell into this mistake; and our best thanks to Mr. Kidd, of Scarborough, who, though he did not first call our attention to the subject, carefully examined the document, and thus aided us in the inquiry. These lines render, of course, unnecessary the insertion of his letter."

It is not for us to pronounce a judgment upon the editor of the *Christian Examiner*; all that is necessary to a just and candid opinion on his conduct, and that of his correspondent, is now before our readers, and they will determine for themselves: but this we will say, that in these times of deplorable estrangement and party hatred, it must be the imperative duty of those who conduct and those who contribute to our religious periodical literature, to use their utmost caution that their quotations are honest, and their inferences just. It is for a lamentation that there is enough coming forth from the press, from day to day, to promote dissension, without needlessly bringing to light again what was printed twenty years ago; enough too to justify and perpetuate existing divisions, without putting into the mouths of our opponents language they never uttered. We fully believe that our brother editor would not intentionally do injustice even to a princely prelate; but, at the same time, the account now given is alike admonitory to him and to ourselves, to take heed in conducting our respective journals, that we needlessly add nothing to an excitement which can do no good,—for "the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God."

EDITOR.

FOR NEW YEAR'S DAY, 1843, BEING THE SABBATH.

Yon rising sun the year begins,
 And 'tis the Sabbath morn;
 It calls me to confess my sins,
 And seek the altar's horn;
 It tells me that my years are few,
 Evil and short my days;
 And bids me serve the Lord anew,
 Devoted to his praise.

It calls me to the holiest, there
 The awful glory reigns,
 Then leads me on to Calv'ry, where
 My soul her pardon gains;
 It bids me rise and go and weep
 Before the sepulchre;
 It says, Rejoice! no guard can keep
 The mighty Conqueror.

He died: then rose for me to God;
 It bids me mark the way,
 'Tis strew'd with spoils, and track'd with blood
 And leads to victory.
 He rose to reign! thy sceptre, Lord,
 Shall rule my heart with love;
 Again he comes! his sov'reign word
 Life from the dead shall prove.

Hail, sacred day, prophetic dawn!
 He comes, the King of kings!
 Heav'n's hallelujahs greet the morn;
 E'en hell its homage brings;
 Ye saints, arise,—prepare the lay,
 My soul, the hour is near,
 The trumpet sounds, and angels say,
 'Tis the Sabbatic year.

T. W.

REVIEWS.

A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, at the Visitation in October, 1842, by Charles James, Lord Bishop of London. 8vo. London.

THE Bishop of London considers the present controversy, which is now "carrying on" in the church, as of so much consequence, that he thinks it right that what he has to say to the clergy, on the present occasion, should entirely relate to this all-absorbing subject. He is sensible, he says, that he is expected to speak with the authority belonging to his office, on matters respecting which his clergy have a right to know his opinion; and which relate partly to the doctrines, and partly to the ritual of the church. He avowedly abstains from lengthened argument and discussion, and evidently wishes to be understood as speaking *ex cathedra*. He hoped that those who are engaged in the present controversy would have seen the evils that must, he thinks, ensue to the church from its continuance, and would have been led to modify some of their opinions, or "at least to keep them within their own bosoms." But his lordship has been disappointed, it seems, in supposing that the Puseyite clergy would consent to regard their favourite dogmas as something only esoteric, and to be held *in petto*. No; there is somewhat more of a self-sacrificing spirit in a thorough-going Puseyite; and the bishop clearly sees that he has awkward materials to deal with. The Puseyites, therefore, must be managed; and, besides, some of their notions constitute rather a "flattering unction" to the souls of the right reverend spiritual descendants and successors of the fishermen of Galilee. Hence his lordship has had rather a difficult course to steer: but he has done his task with considerable adroitness, and has shown a tolerable acquaintance with both wind and tide. In their mode of talking of the church of Rome, and their coaxing behaviour towards that community, we must admit (to do the bishop justice) that the Puseyites get little encouragement from him; and, in several passages of this charge, he speaks out strongly against several of the prominent doctrines of Popery. Towards sundry ceremonies, he is more indulgent; and, though he here adopts his usual caution, the query is, whether, by the concessions which he appears to make, he is not, in certain quarters, raising a ghost which he may find it somewhat difficult to lay.

Of the spirit in which the diocesan of London enters on the subject, the declaration with which he sets out will convey some idea; and will, at the same time, show how far the genuine ecclesiastic views the question, "What is truth?" in the light of the New Testament. "It remains for me," says the bishop, "to perform the duty of pronouncing that deliberate judgment which the clergy of my own diocese

are entitled to look for. In so doing, it will be my endeavour, in humble reliance upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit, not to enter into a polemical discussion on the truth of the doctrines, or the propriety of the rites and ceremonies, which will come under consideration; but to act as an interpreter of the church's sense as to the one and of her will as to the other. If these can be clearly ascertained, we can have no difficulty, looking to the relation in which we stand to her, as to what we are to teach, or how we are to minister," etc.—pp. 6, 7. We are about as clear that our humble pages will not find their way to the right reverend father, as to the "Son of Heaven," autocrat of the celestial empire of China: otherwise we would apologize for assuring his lordship that we found it not an easy task, grave as the subject is, to repress a smile in our editorial sleeves, when we read the above passage. We can readily conceive that, among the clergy who surrounded the altar, and made respectful obeisances, ever and anon, while the successor of the apostles was giving forth the law, with all the authority with which the secular power invests him, there might be those who came with a conscience somewhat burthened amidst the bewilderment occasioned by the struggle between evangelical views and ecclesiastical obligations. Glad might these good men be when they were told, at the beginning, that they were, at least, to hear a discourse immediately bearing on the grand objects of their ministry, having a direct relation to certain great questions of truth and discipline; and not a parliamentary speech, as has too often been the case at episcopal visitations, on tithes, glebe, parsonage houses, clerical fees, and the various secularities of a kingdom which is of this world. But how odd, surely, must it have sounded in the ears of any serious and anxious inquirers after truth, men who felt that the Puseyites had, at all events, somewhat to say for themselves, on some points, as *churchmen*, although much that seemed hard to reconcile with the New Testament—how unsatisfactory to honest and faithful pastors wishing to avail themselves of the learning, experience, and piety of their superior in the church, to be told that the question was *not* to be respecting the scriptural *truth* of the points to be discussed, but only whether the *church* sanctions this or that opinion or practice! How distant must such of the clergy as would be glad of some further reform in the church, have felt the prospect to be, when they were informed that they have nothing to do with the *truth* of certain matters, but only with the inquiry whether they are strictly ecclesiastical! We know that there are men such as we have described, in the diocese of London, and that they have groaned in secret over what they know not how, and dare not attempt, to remedy.

"You are anxious, reverend brethren, for some light to be thrown on the very peculiar and awkward position in which our church is placed. Some of you, also, have long felt it a difficult task to reconcile sundry doctrines of our church with the New Testament. The Puseyites

have brought forward these opinions with greater prominence than ever, as really those of the church; and though they have certainly, in an unwarrantable manner, attempted to foist other doctrines from Rome upon us, still they seem to have some reason for a good deal which they enforce as truly belonging to our church. You might suppose that, at this juncture, your diocesan would enter into a serious comparison of the given points with the testimony and the spirit of the inspired writers, and would endeavour to quiet your scruples by a direct appeal to the law and to the testimony of revelation. But I shall do no such thing: *in reliance upon the Holy Spirit, I shall not discuss the truth of the doctrines, or the propriety of the rites and ceremonies, which will come under consideration: I shall only act as interpreter of the church's sense as to the one, and of her will as to the other.*"

We have been told that some of the Hindoos, having heard so much of the power and greatness of the *East India Company*, have got the notion that this appellation designates some venerable *old lady* who resides in Leadenhall Street, and issues thence her mandates for the government of her swarthy subjects in the East. And really the language which is sometimes held by grave and learned clerks about the church is apt to be so strongly, so hyperbolically metaphorical, that we have occasionally been amused with figuring to ourselves some ancient matron, who, after all that is said of diocesan power, is to be ultimately appealed to in matters which, in our own simplicity, we had thought belonged to the spiritual kingdom and rule of Jesus Christ. We are not only told that the bishops are heads of *the church*, and that the king or queen is *the* head of the church, but we are also told of a sort of venerable personage, who is so far a real entity, that these very heads of the church, and all the laity to boot, (which two parties, we supposed, must constitute the entire church,) stand in a peculiar "relation to her;" and it seems that, like other old ladies who are rich, she has a *will* of her own. Whoever the said old lady may be, (and we sadly fear she is far advanced in her dotage,) it seems that the bishops are very fond of talking of her prerogatives, and that they pay at least equal homage to her as to apostles and evangelists. What her locality is, we must leave our readers to find out; for we have never been able to ascertain. Her existence, apart from bishops, clergy, and laity, is matter of faith not of sight, (for all appeal to her;) and his lordship quotes another episcopal authority to show that, whoever and wherever she is, she is a personage "in whose motherhood we have all just cause to pride ourselves;" and, truly, we must allow that here the effect very faithfully answers to the cause. She "hath in much wisdom and piety delivered her judgment concerning all necessary points of religion. The voice of God our Father in his Scriptures, and (out of them) the voice of the Church our Mother in her Articles, is that which must both guide and settle our resolutions."

If the bishop had implored the influence of the Divine Spirit, to guide him and his clergy into a serious inquiry whether a great reform might not be made in the church, in order to bring it, if possible, more into harmony with the letter and spirit of the New Testament, the invocation would have been appropriate; but, as it is, the effect is somewhat ludicrous, and the reader feels the natural tendency which arises from those incongruities which are wont to excite men's risibility: for when we are expecting a serious aspiration, like that of the Apostle Paul, that the "Spirit of wisdom and revelation" might unfold the truth of God, we meet with a prayer that the Holy Spirit may guide the right reverend father, not into a careful inquiry into the "*truth* of the doctrines, or of the propriety of the rites and the ceremonies, but to act as interpreter of the church, and *her* will." We should have thought that no human decrees with respect to Divine truth, or any obligations under which men may have brought themselves, ought ever to be supposed of force enough to shut up the question, What is the will of God? Human interpretations may have been wrong, human obligations rashly and sinfully entered on, and the high principles of Christian ethics may require that they should be revoked. Changing circumstances, and new controversies, or old ones revived, may always authorize a careful revisal of principles: but our diocesan attempts at once to put an end to all the qualms which any of the more devout and conscientious clergy might feel, by announcing that they are to abide solely by the *will* of that mysterious and indefinable personage, *the church*. We are quite aware, notwithstanding all that we have said, that this may be all very consistent with the nature and the principle of an hierarchical establishment; and it may be the shortest and most summary method of trying to settle controversies. But if so, all we can say is, that the spirit of such a church is quite at variance with that of the New Testament, in which the only appeal is to *the truth as revealed*.

After all, the affair is no nearer to an end. As matter of fact, we find less agreement in the Church of England, on points of doctrine, than we do among the general dissenting body, including Congregationalists, (i. e. Independents and Baptists,) Wesleyans, Presbyterians, Moravians, and others; Unitarians alone, a very small body, excepted, a body, too, who have had their representatives in the Church of England itself. Even in our own times, after all that has been said of the wonderful advantage which is to be found in a compulsory establishment for promoting "uniformity" of doctrine and discipline, and thereby unity of heart, what is the fact? In the Church of England, notwithstanding canons, articles, ecclesiastical courts, and episcopal charges, and all that they can do to promote oneness of opinion, as to doctrine, discipline, or even the very basis on which the church is to rest, we still find the Erastianism of Paley and Warburton, the Mille-

narianism of the modern school, the tropical heats of ultra-Calvinism, the arctic snows of Pelagianism, the old *poco curante* fox-hunting orthodoxy, the Romanizing views of the Puseyites, high-church, and low-church, and we know not what besides. And yet the bishops, with a very few exceptions, do not see, or are afraid to act out the perception, that the church cannot long be propped up on the old system: it seems to escape them that she is like some of those half-wrecks that lie partly above and partly under water on the sea-shore, and which, if they cannot be raised and got afloat with the tide, must ere long go to pieces, by the perpetual wear and tear of the waves. We are not speaking merely as dissenters, when we say that "the church" has been left behind in the celebrated "march of intellect." Whether it is possible that so old and shaky a house can be thoroughly and substantially repaired, without endangering the utter downfall of the whole fabric, is, indeed, a question which we leave to wiser heads than ours; but certain it is, that all reflecting persons who are not interested in the perpetuation of abuses, or committed to their continuance, have long seen that the progress of society is at variance, in the long run, with so contradictory and inconsistent a system as the present Church of England.

On the whole, the bishop's charge, it must be fairly admitted, tends, in some respects, to check the over-strained pretensions of Puseyism. It is probable, we think, that his lordship would have preferred the good old high church orthodoxy, as less calculated to alarm people than the bold and ghostly claims of the Oxford school. But now that the Tractarians have made no small impression, and are turning a good many young heads at college with the inflated conceit of their own importance, and the sentimentalism of a few more showy ceremonies, the question is,—What is to be done? The tide cannot be entirely opposed. To attempt it would be something like acting Dame Partington over again. The business then must be managed as dexterously as possible. The bishop, therefore, knowing the weak side (of the people, especially,) does not seem to frown on a little indulgence as to rites, though he certainly does manfully protest against symbolizing with certain Romish doctrines. Undoubtedly some innovations are tolerated in his diocese, which must strike every observer. We happened to look into a church toward the west end of the town not long ago, and found four or five priests, all in surplices, celebrating the service. The sides of the reading-desk were taken out, so that the priest who read the prayers could be seen at full length, and all his movements and gesticulations, which were not a few. Sometimes he turned one way, and sometimes another, while the other surpliced priests had their faces towards the altar. The organ was in perpetual requisition, as the *amens*, etc., were chanted by the priests, and accompanied on the organ. The sermon was in praise of the poor, and to prove that the

clergy were their natural friends and guardians: indeed, a stranger would hardly have supposed that he was hearing a clergyman of a church in which pluralism has been notorious, and where thousands a year are often lavished on the services, or perhaps the sleeping-partnership, of a single individual. The "Holy Mother," too, the "Blessed Virgin," was in so many words, in Catholic phrase, held forth for peculiar reverence and imitation.

The Bishop of London, in this charge, reiterates the assertion that "in this country the clergy of the national church, and they alone, are entitled to the respect and obedience of the people, as their lawful guides and governors in spiritual things; that they alone are duly commissioned to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments." This, of course, will please the Oxford sect of the church right well. So would not say Archbishop Whately. On his principles, and they are ours, every Christian church has a right to govern itself, and to appoint its own ministers, without the authoritative interference of any other. We have figured to ourselves the satisfaction we should have in seeing his grace break the lance of friendly controversy with his lordship. But this would be too good. Nor is it necessary: for the very fact that there are men in the church whose opinions are at antipodes, and who maintain these opinions, is utterly fatal to the boasted presence of church unity. But how different the tone and claims of the apostle Paul from those of his successor. The apostle *rejoiced* that Christ was preached even though of envy and strife: the Bishop of London feels himself annoyed, and his authority not revered, when Christ is preached, even by such a man as the mild and holy Doddridge, or the heavenly-minded Watts, unless it be in *his* church! How different the truly evangelical spirit, the brotherly, catholic open-heartedness of Paul, from the ecclesiastical spirit bred at Rome and cherished in Protestant churches! How far from the mild and generous tone of the apostles, the lordly, priestly, arbitrary, arrogant spirit, which is too often characteristic of a secular and hierarchical establishment, calling itself Protestant!

We must, however, do the bishop the justice to inform our readers that he decidedly repudiates all approach to the Romish doctrine of a human priesthood. He strenuously maintains that Christ is the only sacrificing priest, and "in opposition to the church of Rome," that "the offering of a propitiatory sacrifice to God is not one of the functions and privileges of the Christian ministry. We derogate from the absolute worthiness and sufficiency of that offering, if we suppose that any supplementary sacrifices are required for the purpose of propitiation. As to our priesthood, let us beware of arrogating to ourselves the character of mediators between God and men, in any sense which implies that we can stand between them and their Judge, except with reference to that mysterious efficacy which belongs to Christian inter-

cession, by whomsoever offered, if offered in faith, and which it is our special duty to offer in behalf of the people committed to our care."

His lordship goes on to remark that "no real good can be effected by any attempts to make our reformed church appear to symbolize with that from which she has separated, in some of the very points which formed the ground of that separation. Desirable as is the union of the Catholic church, we can never consent to reinstate it by embracing any one of the errors which we have renounced. Yet there is no other method than that of embracing *all* those errors, by which a reconciliation could be effected between our own church and that of Rome. Read the recently published letter of Dr. Wiseman on Catholic Unity; and you will see that he stands at the door, and holds it open to those amongst us who profess, as he says, to be conscious, 'that re-union with the Holy See will give vigour and energy to a languid existence, and who must be prepared to go the full extent of sacrifice of personal feelings, necessary to accomplish so sacred a purpose.' He beckons them in with gracious words of commendation, but not a step does he advance beyond the threshold to meet them; not an error does he promise to renounce; not even a glimmering hope does he hold out of any reformation. I believe that the number of those who are prepared to apostatize to an idolatrous church, is very inconsiderable. But a greater evil than the apostasy of a few, or even of many, would be the success of any attempt to establish the fact, not indeed of a perfect identity, but of something more than a sisterly resemblance between the two churches; and to prove that a member of the Anglican church can consistently hold all the errors of the Roman, except one or two of the most flagrant, and even *them* it may be, with certain qualifications."

In order to do justice to the Bishop of London, we must again quote him, that our readers may have a right impression of his opinions. "I think it," says his lordship, "a mistaken and dangerous position, to maintain that without the creeds, we could not have discovered for ourselves some of the great doctrines of the faith, that, for instance, of the holy and undivided Trinity. To suppose that the Spirit of God dictated the *materials* only of saving truth to be written by his inspired servants, while He communicated the right interpretation of them, *not* to be committed to writing till after a considerable period of time, is surely an hypothesis of the most unreasonable and improbable kind: yet this is the position which must ultimately be taken by those who maintain that the Bible could not have been fully understood without the creeds." "I set a very high value upon those ancient formularies of catholic belief: but I am firmly persuaded that if no such formularies had ever been drawn out, all the essential doctrines of Christianity would have been discoverable in the Bible."

The bishop lays it down as a rule that "it may safely be pronounced of any explanation of an article which cannot be reconciled with the

plain language of the offices for public worship, that it is not the doctrine of the church." On this principle he declares that though "the opinion which denies baptismal regeneration might, possibly, though not without great difficulty, be reconciled with the language of the 27th Article, by no stretch of ingenuity, nor latitude of explanation, can it be brought to agree with the plain, unqualified language of the offices for baptism and confirmation." This is honest, and, we think, a fair view of the subject; and the Evangelical clergy will do well, here, to hearken to the decided opinion of their learned diocesan, as highly worthy of their consideration, when they are disposed to try, (certainly by no small "stretch of ingenuity,") to persuade themselves that *their* views of the scripture doctrine of regeneration may be reconciled with the views of the church. The bishop also declares that "it is the plain doctrine of our church, that baptism is instrumentally connected with justification, as the sacrament of the Lord's supper is with sanctification." His lordship gives the following summary of the doctrine of the church "as to the Christian's spiritual life." "Justification begins in baptism, when the children of wrath are regenerated by water and the Holy Ghost, and are made children of God. Remission of sins is expressly declared to be *then* given; and remission of sins implies justification, in the proper sense of the term. Grace is also then given; and by virtue of that grace, the person receiving it, and thenceforth using and improving it, continues to believe in the atonement made by Jesus Christ, and to seek for and realize the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and to be renewed day by day in the inner man. As long as he does this, he continues in a state of justification: his sins, which cleave even to the regenerate, are forgiven, as they are repented of and forsaken; and the work of sanctification goes on." What follows we do not quote, as we think the Evangelical clergy would not object to it; but we should like to know, if the above be the doctrine of the Church of England, which no less an authority than the Bishop of London says it is, how the Evangelical clergy can reconcile it with their views of the statements of the New Testament. Is the bishop wrong? is the church wrong? or are the Evangelical clergy wrong? but they are pledged most solemnly to the church! and this is the uniformity and the unity produced by creeds, canons, acts of parliament, and ecclesiastical courts!

After very properly declaring against the popish dotage adopted by the Puseyites respecting *reserve* in communicating religious knowledge, his lordship proceeds "to offer some observations on the duty of complying with the church's directions in the celebration of divine service. Our proper rules in this respect are the Rubric and the Canons. Now it is impossible to deny, that a great degree of laxity has crept over us in this matter; and we are much indebted to those pious and learned men, who have forcibly recalled our attention to a branch of duty too

long imperfectly performed. In some instances, they have gone beyond the line of prudence and duty in recommending or practising ceremonies and forms not authorized by our church, and in ascribing to others an importance that does not belong to them; but there can be no doubt of their having mainly contributed to the progress, which has been made during the last few years, towards a full and exact observance of the church's rubrical injunctions." Thus does the bishop give some consolation to the Tractarian school. "Far from questioning the *right* of the clergy to observe the Rubric in every particular, I know it to be their *duty*; and the only doubt is, how far are *we* justified, in not *enforcing* such observance in every instance. It may, indeed, call for the exercise of a sound discretion, in certain cases, as to the time and mode of bringing about an entire conformity in your practice, in this respect, with the letter of the laws: but I cannot, as it appears to me, consistently with my duty, interpose any obstacles, nor offer any objection, to its being done. I wish this observation to be understood, as applicable not only to the administration of public baptism at the time prescribed by the Rubric, to the reading of the Offertory sentences, and the prayer for the church militant, but to the observance of the days, which the church appoints to be kept holy." His lordship then tells the clergy that it is their duty to celebrate Divine service, not only on the Nativity, Crucifixion, and Resurrection of our Lord, but also the Circumcision, Manifestation to the Gentiles, and Ascension. It is his "wish," he says, that, "in obedience to the church's directions," they should celebrate public worship on all the anniversaries of those events, on every day in Passion-week, upon the Mondays and Tuesdays after Easter-day and Whit-Sunday, and on Ash-Wednesday. The bishop further adds, that by specifying these particular days, he does not mean to insinuate that the other festivals and fasts of the church are not also to be duly kept. He considers that the reason commonly assigned for the non-observance of some of these "holy days," namely, that the people will not go to church, is not of any weight against "the plain requirements of the law;" and the bishop says that he has been asked "whether he approved of certain changes in the mode of celebrating Divine service, which were spoken of as novelties, but which were in fact nothing more than a return to the anciently established order of the church."

The Rubric directs that prayers are to be said, morning and evening, in every parish church or chapel, when the minister is at home, and not reasonably hindered. His lordship considers himself the judge of the circumstances under which it may be proper to *require* such celebration; but at all events every clergyman is "more than justified in saying daily prayers in the church." The bishop wishes the "experiment to be tried" not on Wednesdays and Fridays only, but on every day in the week. We confess we do not envy the clergy, in the

prospect, (perhaps when the Puseyites have got the tide up a little stronger still, so as to make it appear like a concession to clerical opinion,) the prospect of the monotonous business of being compelled to go and say prayers, hail, rain, or shine, every day, to the clerk, sexton, and a few poor old souls who are bribed, perhaps, by the parish doles, to keep the business from descending quite to the predicament of Jonathan Swift, and "dearly beloved Roger." It is quite in keeping with the *sacramental* notions of clerical spiritualism, to propose to drag people every day from their homes, to say a form of prayer which is always the same; but the bishop "knows no reason why this practice should not be resorted to in country parishes," as well as "in towns." His lordship seems to entertain a prodigious idea of the effect which might thus be produced. In short, there would seem to be a power, a mystic power, to be anticipated from saying prayers in a consecrated building, with the attendance of a consecrated priest, a successor of the apostles, which mortals can with difficulty comprehend. Again does Dr. Blomfield introduce that venerable, mysterious, undefined personage, the ladye church, whose *will* and whose "ritual" are paramount too often, we fear, both to reason and to Scripture. His lordship, is, truly, a genuine son of "mother church:" he says, "The truth is, reverend brethren, that, until the church's intentions are completely fulfilled as to her ritual, we do not know what the church really is, nor what she is capable of effecting. It is the instrument by which she seeks to realize and apply her doctrines; and the integrity and purity of the one may, as to their effect, be marred and hindered, in what degree we know not, by a defective observance of the other."

The bishop thinks it obligatory on the members of the church to use the prescribed postures, and to "do lowly reverence, when, in the time of Divine service, the Lord Jesus is mentioned." He sees "no very serious objection to the custom observed for many years in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, of doing obeisance on entering and leaving churches and chancels." He does not sanction the minister in turning his back to the congregation; but he approves "the arrangement lately adopted in several churches, where the reading-desk is near the east end of the church, by which the clergyman looks towards the south while reading the prayers, and towards the west while reading the lessons." Candles, it seems, may henceforth, on episcopal authority, be placed on the altar, but they should not be lighted excepting in the evening. Clergymen are to wear the surplice while reading the prayer for the church militant, and it seems to be important that when a clergyman preaches after the morning service, he should preach in his surplice, but in the evening, it appears, the gown is more advisable.

Against the ultra-Puseyism of praising the mass-book, Romish homilies, qualified prayers to saints, intercessions for the dead, auricular confession, and the like, the bishop boldly declares himself. He

admits that "we are, in some respects, trammelled and impeded by our connexion with the state; but this will not be remedied by a return to exploded opinions or practices;" and he suspects that "the desire of reverting to *them*, with less of impediment than now exists, is one motive, with some persons, who are seeking to effect a total separation of the church from the state." That his lordship is not prepared at all to sympathize with those who wish to dissolve the alliance, appears plainly enough from his devout aspiration that more money may shortly be poured into the coffers of the church, by the government, to enable her to carry on her building projects.

Upon the whole, while it must be confessed, that Dr. Blomfield repeatedly speaks in very strong terms against popery, (and we have not quoted the most pungent passages of this kind,) and cautions the clergy against the ultra form of Puseyism in which it is scarcely different from Romanism itself; nevertheless, so far as what is external is concerned, the Puseyites must consider that they have obtained some countenance from his lordship. Whatever he may say to the contrary, it is certain that by endeavouring to bring back the church to the Rubric, he is promoting a nearer external resemblance, at least, to the Church of Rome. It remains to be seen how far the clergy of the diocese will comply with his wishes. It appears to us, that if anything like an important majority of them were at once to adopt the obsolete observances of the Rubric, in certain ceremonies, daily prayers in the churches, and the like, and to comply with the various points of discipline respecting which it is evident that the bishop is anxious there should be *uniformity*, he would not hesitate to put forth the crozier, and hook into the pen, by force, any black sheep that might still choose to wander from the path which this gentle shepherd has, in terms of moderation, but with a certain undertone of significant import, marked out. There are not wanting indications of a little waywardness on the part of those to whom the Lord Bishop of London subscribes himself in the dedication, "with sentiments of the truest regard and respect, their faithful *friend* and brother." It will be remembered, that one who washed beggars' feet, and humbly styled himself *servus servorum*, expected even kings and emperors to wait at his palace-door, and to hold his stirrups. His lordship is not yet in a position which some have thought is destined for him, and should the juncture arrive, it remains to be seen whether the government would venture to entrust St. Peter's great key into the hands of one who, if we may judge from a certain tone and bearing, might be expected to exhibit it rather more openly than has been done, for a generation or two, by the mild personages who have so meekly borne the high faculty of primate of all England. In the present day, however, even ecclesiastical authority can hardly be exercised in the nett. There must be some *management*. Hence it would seem, if report be true, that the recent meeting of the London clergy at Sion Col-

lege, was not a spontaneous movement, on their part, but a covert putting forth of the *feelers* of episcopal power, in order to sound the clerical mind as to a stricter observation of the obsolete regulations of the Rubric. But we are told that the business was a total failure; so that his lordship's *savoir faire* has not, in this instance, turned to very good account; and one would suppose that he must find himself between the horns of a dilemma; for what is to be done? is his lordship to enforce the Rubric with the "authority of office" of which he so repeatedly, and somewhat ominously, speaks in this charge? or are the decidedly expressed wishes, and "authoritative directions" of one who claims to be a successor of the apostles, to go for nought? The whole affair of the Oxford Tractarianism, and the odd position in which the various sects or denominations within the pale of the church are placed with regard to each other, might well, surely, cause Dissenters to chuckle, when they remember that this Babel of confusion, as to doctrine, ritual, and discipline, is all found within the walls of an establishment which boasts of the Act of Uniformity as reducing the whole chaos of conflicting opinions to order and beauty. But more serious reflections are wont to pre-occupy their minds; for in the defalcation of some of the Evangelical clergy from the weightier matters of the Gospel to the mint, anise, and cummin of mere empty forms and ceremonies, they see obstacles to the progress of genuine truth, if not to the civil and religious liberties of mankind.

Morning and Evening Exercises for every Day in the Year. By William Jay. 4 vols. pp. 591, 603, 658, 684. *Being the first four volumes of the Works of the Author, collected and revised by Himself.* Bartlett, London, 1842.

WHEN these valuable additions to the devotional libraries of Christian readers were first published, we gave them our cordial commendation; and our increased acquaintance with them has only increased our conviction of their practical worth to evangelical believers of every denomination. They were not written for a party, but to refresh and gladden the whole church of Christ; and it is a matter for sincere congratulation, that in the face of hostile influences they have found a place in the closets of devout persons of every name, and of every station in life. In January, 1841, their beloved and venerated author completed the fiftieth year of his pastoral labours in the Congregational church at Bath, and on that occasion addressed his attached people in the following affecting passage.

"To how many of you is my ordination a matter of history! You have been born since that day, which many of your fathers and mothers attended. How many of you have I taken in these hands, and offered to God in holy baptism! How many of you have I hailed at your coming to the table of the Lord! And how many of

your connexions have I followed to our burying-ground! 'Ah!' says one, 'there lies my cherub child!' 'And,' says another, 'there lies the desire of mine eyes, taken away with a stroke.' 'And there,' says another, 'lies the guide of my youth.' I am glad, therefore, when every church has a place of interment of their own: it seems keeping up still a kind of connexion with the departed. Our dead lie not among strangers. 'There I buried Abraham, and Sarah his wife; there I buried Isaac, and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah.' We have all our precious dust in yonder ground! where is the person belonging to us who does not go to the grave to weep there? I am sometimes ready to be jealous lest our burying-place should become richer than our church. But no; instead of the fathers are the children. Our sons are plants grown up in their youth; our daughters are corner-stones, polished after the similitude of palaces: and we have a noble band of the young and middle-aged, who have covenanted with God, and who are saying, We will not forsake the house of our God. Oh, how does old age, while it leaves life, peel off continually its connexions, till we seem left even as a beacon upon the top of a mountain, or as an ensign upon the hill! Oh, how many of the various relations of life, during such a varied and extensive acquaintance as mine, have gone down to the dust, and have seen corruption! How many ministers have been taken away! 'The fathers, where are they? and the prophets, do they live for ever?' Of all the ministers that belonged to the Wiltshire Association when I entered it, I am the only survivor: and of all those who signed my call when I came here, only one remains, whose venerable head you would have seen here this day but for indisposition. And, oh! what a curtailment are fifty years in a brief duration like ours! Your preacher, therefore, feels this; and though, in some measure, he can talk like Caleb, who said, 'As yet I am as strong this day as I was in the day that Moses sent me: as my strength was then, even so is my strength now, for war, both to go out and to come in;' yet he does not forget that 'the days of our years are threescore years and ten.' Yes: therefore a period cannot be far remote when, as he hopes he shall never stand in the way of usefulness, he will either entirely resign his labours, or share them with another: and, though he knows the extreme difficulty attached to a concern where three parties are so deeply interested, the Lord can provide.

"Now I seem to be taking a farewell of the fifty years which I have passed within these happy walls! What a difference between the day of which I am reminded, and this day! Then, I was rapidly entering life: I am now gradually withdrawing from it. Then, I was commencing my voyage across an untried ocean: now, with the glass in my hand, I am looking for the fair havens. Then, I was a mere youth: now, surrounded with children and grandchildren. What was then anxiety is now repose; what was then hope is now accomplishment; what was then prayer is now praise. What a season of humiliation, you will naturally conclude, must this have been! We are hardly aware of our deficiencies and imperfections till something occurs which drives us to retire, and reflect, and review. But who can look back upon fifty years, and not exclaim, 'Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord: for in thy sight shall no flesh living be justified?' 'O Lord, if thou shouldest mark iniquity, O Lord, who can stand?'"

This seemed prophetic of a speedy close of his valued labours. But, as on that occasion, his "eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated," so it was hoped that the Lord would "add unto his days" years of usefulness and honour. This has been already realized, and none who heard our honoured brother preach at the jubilee of Cheshunt College, or who has read this greatly improved edition of his "Exercises," but must have rejoiced in these proofs of undiminished vigour.

We have stated that these volumes, though complete in themselves, form the first four of a uniform and entire edition of Mr. Jay's publications. This has often been desired by his English friends, and has actually been anticipated by his American admirers, who published at Baltimore an edition which "comprised all, or nearly all, that he had written, down to the year 1832, when it issued from the press."

The "whole series" from the English press will, necessarily, be more complete than that, as it will be "collected and revised by the author," and will contain "some prefatory and explanatory notes, with considerable insertions and enlargements."

The peculiarity of the present edition is, "the *uniting* of the Morning and the Evening Exercises for every day: before, they were in separate volumes," so that you must have had *two* volumes in constant use. The present form is a great improvement, and much more convenient, either for daily perusal at home, or for making the work a travelling companion.

In looking through these volumes, we were happy again to read Mr. Jay's beautiful dedicatory letter to Mr. Wilberforce, and we marked the following paragraphs, which recite the unequivocal tokens of friendship which Mr. Wilberforce had given him.

"It is now more than forty years since the writer of this address was indulged and honoured with your notice and friendship. During this period (so long in the brevity of human life!) he has had many opportunities of deriving great pleasure and profit from your private conversation; and also in observing in your public career the proofs you displayed of the orator, the statesman, the advocate of enlightened freedom, and the feeling, fearless, persevering, and successful opponent of a traffic that is 'a reproach to any people.'

* * * * *

"Nor can I omit the opportunity of acknowledging individually the obligations I feel myself under to your zeal and wisdom, when, in the noviciate of my ministry, your correspondence furnished me with hints of admonition, instruction, and encouragement, to which I owe much of any degree of acceptance and usefulness with which I have been favoured.

* * * * *

"There has been, perhaps, some little shade of difference in our doctrinal views; but as it has not been sufficient to impair your approbation of my preaching and writings, so I am persuaded you will find nothing in these volumes, should you ever look into them, to offend, even if an occasional reflection does not *perfectly* suit your own convictions. In one thing it is certain we differ. We are not unwilling respectively to own the Episcopalian and the Dissenter. But in this distinction we feel conviction without censure, and avow preference, without exclusion.

* * * * *

"You, my dear Sir, are a proof that Christian liberality may abound, without laxity and without inconsistency. And other instances of the same lovely character are increasingly coming forward; in which we see how rigid contention for minor partialities can yield to the force of Christian charity, and disappear before the grandeur of 'the common salvation,' and the grace of 'one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.'"

It appears to us most extraordinary that the man who could excite such acknowledgments, and accept them too, should have recorded in his private diary, in which he noted every body, only expressions of slight, if not contempt, towards Mr. Jay. Yet such appears to be the case, if we are to decide on the evidence supplied by his biographers. The name of Mr. Jay occurs but four times in the five volumes of "The Life of William Wilberforce." Once to recite his humble origin, once to quote a fact, on his authority, against dissenters, and twice to make the following remarks:—"Asked to subscribe to Jay's velvet cushion, but refused;"—"I found so much made of my going to Jay's that I have kept away." Can we suppose, that Mr. Wilberforce concealed beneath a smooth surface of catholicity and kindness that contempt for dissenters which is so common amongst churchmen? or are we to infer, that his "venerable" sons have taken care to insert these hasty slips of his pen, while they have suppressed passages, which, written in a better mood, record his respect for the piety, and his admiration of the eloquence, of the truly venerable preacher? It is an "ugly alternative"—and we must decline to choose.

Returning to the immediate subject in hand, we cannot refrain from quoting the following delightful bit of literary autobiography. The author

"Had passed between thirty and forty years of his ministry before he availed himself of a few weeks for an annual relaxation from his stated labours; and when he adopted the plan, these seasons were not with him entire cessations from engagement. Not only did he find the leisure useful to his health and spirits, and affording him opportunities for reflection and preparation for preaching, but he often employed a good portion of it in composition for the press.

"Several of his publications were thus begun, and several considerably advanced.

"At Sidmouth he began his 'Domestic Minister's Assistant,' and wrote many of the 'Family Prayers.' In the Isle of Wight he composed 'A Charge to a Minister's Wife' and 'The Wife's Advocate.' At Lynmouth he finished his 'Christian Contemplated,' and wrote the Preface with 'Hints on Preaching.'

"But this latter place must be a little more noticed. There, for several years successively, he passed a month, the most perfectly agreeable and happy he ever experienced in a life of loving kindness and tender mercy.

"Linton and Lynmouth are nearly connected; the one being at the top and the other at the bottom of a declivity covered with trees and verdure, interspersed with several houses. Linton has been remarked for its sublimity and Lynmouth for its beauty—and their united aspects have been called Switzerland in miniature.

"Lynmouth was to the author the most interesting spot. Here two narrow and craggy valleys, obviously once ruptured by a convulsion of nature, terminate; and down these, tumbling from rock to rock, two streams—one running from the east and the other from the south—unite, and, then, in a small distance, empty themselves into the sea.

"At the time of his first going there it was hardly known or considered as a watering-place. It had not therefore as yet fallen into the corruptions of such receptacles—nor had the inhabitants been taught to make visitors a prey. The villagers were very respectful; and strangers felt a sense of perfect safety.

"Here the author fixed his residence. He took a whole cottage; it was far from elegant, but it was neat and agreeable; it wanted some accommodation and com-

forts: but he had what he more prized—rural and enchanting scenery and solitude—yet not without some to hear the exclamation, ‘How sweet this solitude is!’ For he had society too: his company was small, but chosen, and suitable and improving—

“ ‘Where friendship full exerts her softest pow’r,
Perfect esteem, enlivened by desire
Ineffable, and sympathy of soul,
Thought meeting thought, and will preventing will,
With boundless confidence.’

“ His associates consisted of his wife and a female friend. It would be vain in him to extol the former; but as to the latter—especially as she was soon removed from our world—he may be allowed to say, we hardly could have had her equal in everything we wished. She was of a very respectable family; well educated, polished in her manners, intellectual, sprightly, witty, truly pious, full of sensibility and benevolence, and an entire stranger to everything like selfishness. What, with regard to this friend before our first excursion together, was acquaintance, was now rendered intimacy the most cordial; and she became a dear resident in the family till her lamented death. The cottage we occupied was near Mr. Herries’ beautiful villa. It has since been spoiled by improvements, and is now a kind of tawdry little mansion; and the whole of Lynmouth itself, which taste might have altered and yet left in a village style, is aping a paltry town.

“ Here our party felt themselves at liberty to meet—or to separate—to read—or to write—or to converse—or to walk, as inclination prompted. As to himself, the author opened his parlour, and spoke on the Sabbath-day evening to any of the neighbours who would attend. But having been struck with the design, and also having been urged to undertake something of the kind, he now began his ‘Morning Exercises.’ Of these, he here often wrote two and sometimes three a day; and always read one of them in the morning and another in the evening devotion—not often without the approbation of his companions, which much excited and encouraged him to proceed.

“ Here he composed the greater part of these *Morning Exercises*, and here also in after visits he wrote the greater part of the *Evening*. He once thought of distinguishing by a final mark all he had written in this retirement—but not doing it immediately, his recollection soon became too indistinct for him to decide with certainty. The first ‘Exercise’ he wrote was that which is entitled, ‘The Unlonely Solitude,’—John xvi. 32: ‘And shall leave me alone, and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me.’

“ He wished also to have marked those which he wrote as he journeyed to and from Lynmouth. At the ‘Plume of Feathers,’ Minehead, where he slept as he was going down, he composed the Exercise called ‘The Pious Excursion,’—1 Sam. iii. 9: ‘Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth,’—especially in reference to such a journey of recreation. At the same inn, as he returned, he composed the Exercise entitled, ‘The Call to Depart,’—Micah ii. 10: ‘Arise and depart hence, for this is not your rest.’ He also wrote a third Exercise at the same inn, viz., ‘Changes in the Wilderness not a Removal from it,’—Numbers x. 12: ‘And the children of Israel took their journeys out of the wilderness of Sinai; and the cloud rested in the wilderness of Paran.’

“ The author cannot conclude without observing two things:—

“ The first is, That relaxation is never so perfectly enjoyed as in connexion with engagement.

“ ‘A want of occupation is not rest;
A mind quite vacant is a mind distress’d.’

Relaxation indeed can have no existence separate from employment ; for what is there then to relax *from*. On the other hand, action prepares for repose ; and labour not only sweetens but justifies recreation — so that we feel it to be, not only innocent indulgence, but a kind of recompence.

"The second is, That as of such a precious talent as time nothing should be lost ; so, much may be done by gathering up its fragments."

We cannot part with these beautiful and convenient volumes without expressing our devout wish, that their beloved author may be spared to complete the editorial labour of collecting and revising his own works, and of enriching them with a series of notes as interesting and instructive as the one just quoted.

CURSORY NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

"THE Lives of the Fathers" appear, at first sight, to be no very suitable work to issue from the press of an institution, pledged as the Religious Tract Society is to ecclesiastical neutrality. It was, therefore, not without some anxiety, that we saw, first, "*The Life of Origen*," and then "*The Life of Cyprian*," announced in their catalogue, lest it should be our painful duty to remonstrate with the committee upon the principles and tendencies of those publications. We therefore carefully read, and with deep interest too, these valuable pieces of patristical biography, and are happy to state, that they are obviously the result of original and learned researches in the works of those celebrated men. The most important facts are brought out with great faithfulness and force, and the tendency of the whole must be to deliver the mind of the reader from that superstitious reverence which is so zealously inculcated in the present day, and which is extensively cherished for the opinions of all who are included amongst the Fathers ! While we say this frankly and fearlessly, yet we feel it right to add, that these valuable little books appear to be written by one who loves to use church terms. The catholicity of the Society requires that phrases that are not acceptable to many of its supporters should be avoided as much as possible. "Holy orders," "ordained priest," "episcopal dignity," "bishoprics," "episcopal claims," "the Christian priesthood," "the prelates," &c., &c., are phrases that it may not be always easy to avoid in writing ecclesiastical biography ; yet, as Nonconformists regard them as signs of things not in accordance with the mind of Christ, the less frequently they occur, in works they subscribe for, the more acceptable will they be. Still these books are far less exceptionable than Cave's Lives of the same writers, and indeed we know not anything in English respecting them equally effective and edifying. (Tract Society.)

The Rev. H. J. Bevis, of Ramsgate, has recently published, at the request of those who heard it, a sermon on the "*Characteristics of Puseyism*," preached in the Academy Chapel at Hoxton. While the limits of a single discourse forbid a comprehensive exhibition of the features of this modern heresy, the author has wisely fixed on its more prominent characteristics, fairly grappled with them, and demonstrated them to be alike unreasonable and unscriptural. Some parts of the sermon are truly eloquent ; and while it is too much to hope that many of those who have imbibed the errors it denounces will be reclaimed by its perusal, it may serve to deter those who are in danger of "turning aside to fables," and as such, has our commendation, to which it is justly entitled. (J. Snow.)

Robert Montgomery's "*Sacred Gift, a Series of Meditations upon Scripture Subjects, with twenty highly finished Engravings after celebrated Paintings by the Great*

Masters," is an extremely elegant quarto volume, without and within. Just the thing for "a sacred gift," and highly calculated to profit and to please. It has not been our lot often to see anything more beautifully executed than are these twenty engravings. Among them we have Rubens' "Judgment of Solomon;" Poussin's "Smitten Rock;" Franklin's "Raising of Lazarus;" Copley's "Abraham Offering Isaac;" West's "David and Nathan;" and fifteen other gems;—all these illustrated by the pen of R. Montgomery, some in prose, others in poetry. "These meditations are submitted," says the author in his address, "with Christian respect to those who love the thoughtful sacredness of subjects like those which the master spirits of painting have immortalized. The facts of religion, the forms of art, and the feelings of poetry, are related to each other by a beautiful and holy concord; and the writer of this will be grateful, if, in the remotest degree, he may have succeeded in illustrating their alliance." We think he has succeeded well. (Fisher, Son, & Co.)

Mrs. H. S. Herschell, who is a most efficient teacher of vocal music, has conferred a great boon upon families who are fond of vocal music, by the publication of "*Fire-side Harmony; or Domestic Recreations in Part Singing: a selection of favourite old Gleees, Rounds, and Canons, arranged in words suitable for Families and Schools.*" In a sensible preface she states her opinion that "it is far from desirable to confine young persons to sacred music alone. There is a light-hearted joyousness in youth, for the expression of which sacred music is inappropriate. Still more inexpedient is it, that this innocent mirth should be tainted with the language of passion, or of intemperance. Much of our fine old part music celebrates the pleasures of the bottle and the chace; while the subjects of some are of still more exceptionable character. The object of the present publication is to remedy this evil; and to give some of the compositions of the older masters of English song, arranged to words that may be sung in the family or the school-room." Thus we have thirty-four fine old pieces, with words from Milton, Scott, Cowper, Hemans, &c., adapted: these are so skillfully harmonized as to secure, we doubt not, general acceptance. (Taylor & Walton.)

We trust that the dissenters of England are not second to any class of their fellow citizens in an enlightened desire to promote the physical, as well as the intellectual improvement of the people. "*The Health of Towns*," therefore, is an object for which we are sure they would zealously labour, knowing, as they well do, that the sanitary condition of the labouring population is very closely connected with their moral advancement. But when a Bill, professing to promote this object, is brought into parliament, that would infringe our personal rights, and augment, to a frightful extent, the revenues and powers of the clergy, which are burdensome enough already, it becomes them to unmask the plausible pretence, and plainly to denounce this new version of episcopal jobbing. This has been done most completely, in a series of twenty-one letters, which first appeared in the columns of *The Patriot*, and are now reprinted in a large but cheap pamphlet, entitled "*Health of Towns: an Examination of the Report and Evidence of the Select Committee on Mr. Mackinnon's Bill, and of the Acts for establishing Cemeteries around the Metropolis.*" This searching investigation of the whole question should be read by all dissenters who have burying-grounds in towns, unless they would be content to see "the place of their fathers' sepulchres" laid "waste." True it is, the government will not support Mr. Mackinnon's Bill, but it is equally true, that they are contemplating a Bill of their own, and that in the present fit of high church mania, with which so many are affected, it impossible to say what may not be attempted. These letters bear such evident marks of the style and talents of the author of "*Jethro*," that there can be no mistake in attributing them to his powerful pen. (John Snow.)

THE EDITOR'S TABLE.

The Nestorians ; or, The Lost Tribes ; containing Evidence of their Identity, their Manners, and Customs, &c. By Asahel Grant, M.D. Second Edition, London : Murray. 1843.

The Secret Disciple ; A Sermon occasioned by the Decease of Miss Selina Sherman. By the Rev. James Sherman. Second Edition. London : Hamilton, Adams, & Co. 1842.

The Congregational Ministry Sustained by a Divine and an Adequate Human Sanction. London : Published for the Congregational Union. Jackson & Walford.

The Intercommunity of Churches ; a Sermon, preached at Liverpool, October 11th, 1842. By the Rev. Richard Winter Hamilton. London : Jackson & Walford, 1842.

Lessons in Reading for Children in Families and Schools. London : Religious Tract Society. 1842.

Hymns and Chants for Sunday Schools. By John Curwen. London : T. Ward & Co. 1842.

The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, A.M. Vol. III. Imp. 8vo. Edinburgh : Ogle. 1842.

The Juvenile Harmonist ; being a Collection of Tunes and Pieces for Children. By T. Clark. London : Sunday School Union. 1842.

Elements of Language and General Grammar. By G. Payne, LL.D. London : John Gladding. 1843.

A Brief Sketch of the Present State and Future Expectations of the Jews. By Ridley H. Herschell. Seventh Thousand. London : J. Unwin. 1842.

Columbus and his Times. London : Religious Tract Society.

Catholic and Evangelical Principles viewed in their present Application to the Church of God. In a Series of Letters. By A. Barrett. London : J. Mason. 1843.

Lecture delivered at the London Tavern on Tuesday, 11th October, 1842, before the Baptist Missionary Society. By the Rev. J. P. Smith, D.D., F.R.S. London. 1842.

Characteristics of Puseyism ; a Sermon. By the Rev. H. J. Bevis. 8vo. London : Snow. 1842.

Health of Towns ; an Examination of Mr. Mackinnon's Bill and of the Acts for Establishing Cemeteries around the Metropolis. 8vo. London : Snow. 1843.

A Discourse on the Studies of Newport Pagnell College. By the Rev. John Watson. London : Snow.

The Divine Warning to the Church ; a Sermon. By the Rev. E. Bickersteth. London : Nisbet.

Sermons by the late Rev. E. Temple, of Rochford. London : Snow.

The Scottish Ecclesiastical Register and National Almanack for 1843. Edinburgh : Patterson.

Fire-Side Harmony. By H. S. Herschell. London : Taylor & Walton.

The Approaching Downfall of Popery and Civil Despotism in Europe. By A Layman. London : Ward & Co.

Observations on the School Return for the Diocese of Bath and Wells. By the Rev. T. Spencer, M.A. London : Green.

The Voice of Christ to the Churches. By Ebenezer Millar, A.M. London : Jackson & Walford.

A Few Facts relative to the Tithe Litigation in the Parish of St. Andrew's, Holborn. London : Hancock.

The Eastern and Western States of America. By J. S. Buckingham, Esq. 3 vols. 8vo. Illustrated with Engravings. London : Fisher, Son, & Co.

Friendly Counsels to Female Servants, especially to those who profess to have become the Servants of Christ. By the Rev. Andrew Thompson. 32mo. Edinburgh: W. Innes. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co. 1842.

The Evils of Popular Ignorance; being the First of a Series of Discourses for the Working Classes. By J. C. Galloway, A.M. Birmingham: B. Hudson.

Remarks on an Exposition of the System pursued by the Baptist Missionaries in Jamaica, by Missionaries and Catechists of the London Missionary Society in that Island; by the Committee of the Baptist Missionary Society. London: Houlston & Stoneman. 1843.

The Works of William Jay: Corrected and Revised by Himself. Vol. V. Memoirs of the late Rev. Cornelius Winter. Post 8vo. London: C. A. Bartlett. 1843.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

WE are happy to learn that the sale of the PATRIOT Newspaper is such, as to enable its proprietors, without an increase of its price, to enlarge its dimensions *one-fifth*. While we have sometimes wished for additional information in its columns, and have not always subscribed to the *ipse dixit* of its gifted Editor, yet we honestly feel that it has many strong claims upon the warm and general support of Evangelical Dissenters. The additional space, we have reason to believe, will be occupied with a class of articles that will greatly increase the interest of this journal, which as the advocate of Evangelical religion, of civil and religious liberty, and enlightened Protestant Nonconformity, we sincerely wish was read in every family connected with our churches.

It gives us satisfaction too, to observe in our advertising pages that THE NON-CONFORMIST is also to be printed on a larger sheet, so as to give space equal to *four additional pages* of its present size. Differing as we are compelled to do with its able Editor in his views on "the complete suffrage" and some minor points, yet we cordially wish success to his "Nonconformist" labours, and honour him as a fearless and powerful advocate of the voluntary principle, and complete religious emancipation.

In the Press, A Discourse on the Oxford Tracts. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, Author of the History of the Great Reformation.

As there has never been a collected edition of the works of the Rev. William Bridge, formerly Pastor of the Congregational Church at Yarmouth, and one of the *five* dissenting Brethren in the Assembly of Divines, we are happy to announce that his *whole works* will be shortly published in three octavo volumes by Messrs. Palmer & Son, Paternoster Row, who will be happy to receive any information concerning this author or his writings, that may tend to the completeness of this edition.

To be published by subscription, in one vol. 8vo, A Hebrew Grammar: Containing a Copious and Systematic Development of the Etymology and Punctuation of that Language. By Samuel Ransom, Classical and Hebrew Tutor in Hackney Theological Seminary. The above work is in three parts. The first part is the accidence, which contains a very full exhibition of all the parts of speech. The second part is on the change of vowels, and, after expounding the general principles operating in those changes, develops their various causes. The third part is on the accents. Here are minutely shown both the *position* and *various uses* of the accents, especially their *principal use* of marking the logical relation of every word in a verse.

CHRONICLE OF BRITISH MISSIONS.

HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

PROSPECTS OF THE HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY FOR 1843.

THESE ought to be pronounced encouraging! This may fairly be done as far as the condition of the stations is concerned. But there are other matters which produce anxiety and call for enlarged exertion.

The particulars respecting the Society's operations and statistics have so recently been published in the Magazine, that they are not required this month. It cannot be concealed from our friends that the Society is commencing the present year in circumstances probably more peculiar than those of any which ever preceded it. Drawing information in a great measure from our own agents scattered over thirty-four counties of England, as to the influence of prevailing heresies in country districts, and the opposition of the preachers of error to the labours of our missionaries, we are obliged to admit that there is cause for anxiety if not for alarm.

There is undoubtedly a deep and a wide spread determination to assert the exclusive claims of prelacy, and, if possible, to get the people to believe that the national clergy alone can safely and savingly preach the Gospel and administer the ordinances of religion. To accomplish this object, which they deem to be essential to their official character, means are employed by them, which as gentlemen accustomed to the proprieties and courtesies of society they would not use; but which, as priests, as Puseyites, as successors of the apostles, they are openly and too generally employing against the faithful men who preach Christ, though unordained by the hands of prelates. We shall give extracts from the journals of our agents, received during the first week of December last, which cannot fail to convince our readers that there is a wild and fanatical spirit spreading through this country, and that it is at the present moment affecting many of the clergy of the national church; that the form it takes is extraordinary zeal for the Anglican Catholic church, and the announcement of certain ruin to all persons not baptized and found in that community. To sustain this fanatical assertion, our agents are denounced by name—they are held up to the ignorant and credulous as the worst enemies they can have. Acts of bigotry and harshness, which these men would be ashamed to perform in ordinary life, are of daily occurrence in the name of the church. The facts now referred to are furnished by men of great sobriety of mind, some of them of considerable experience. They are therefore qualified to speak of the present state of religion, compared with former years. The information furnished by them comes from various districts of England. Along with other facts, which are generally known, it unfolds a new element, in active operation, threatening to burst asunder the social compact, and, in the name of religion, to peril the peace of society. It cannot but produce alienation among the various denominations. On the one hand, an attempt is made to unchristianize all other bodies except one sect, and to pour contempt on their pastors, by declaring them impostors and deceivers. On the other hand, the spirit of resistance and indignation can hardly fail to be produced by treatment like this, which is justly considered as alike unscriptural and presumptuous. How fatal to the spirit of true catholicism must this state of things be! How destructive to the souls of men the errors which are so widely spreading!

We give the following extracts to show not only that error is spreading; but that the attempt to spread it is connected with a spirit of arrogance and injustice, proving the origin of this new-born zeal for the church to be the opposite of that which comes from above.

"The vicar of T—— is a Puseyite, and consequently a violent persecutor of all dissenters, and especially of Congregational Dissent. Hence he is continually preaching against us, and latterly detained the congregation, warning them from attending the preaching room.

"After many unscriptural, uncharitable, and unfounded assertions, mentioning my name, he said, 'I grieve that so many of the town's-people go to hear him. He is an unauthorized hireling,—a wolf in sheep's clothing,—an impostor! He is going to hell himself, and they who attend his ministry will meet the same fate. Do not even pass by the place at the time of their worship, lest you should be tempted to go in, and he should beguile you to your souls' ruin. He is a very dangerous man.' This clergyman has also distributed numbers of tracts against Dissenters, one of which is entitled 'Twenty-four Reasons why I dare not become a Dissenter,' one of the most scandalous and false publications of the sort I ever saw. As an antidote against this, I immediately purchased a number of tracts on 'The Right of Englishmen to hear the Gospel wherever it is preached,' (first published in the Home Missionary Magazine,) which I speedily distributed in every direction. He uses very petty means of annoyance and persecution, a few instances of which I will mention.

"1st. A poor woman, whose child was near death, went to the vicar for a little wine, (which of right belongs to the poor, being that which is left from a plentiful supply for the 'altar,' which very few visit,) for her dying babe, when the following conversation took place.

"Vicar.—'How many children have you?' 'Three, sir.' 'Are any old enough to go to the Sunday school?' 'Yes, sir, one is old enough.' 'To what school does she go?' 'To the Independent school, sir; for it is the nearest.' 'Then,' said the vicar, 'you may go to Mr. S. for your wine.'

"2nd. There having been doles of flannel, etc., left to the poor of T—— by charitable persons, which are distributed at certain seasons of the year, a poor woman whose child had been severely burnt, and had lately come out of the Infirmary, so maimed as to disqualify her for ever from obtaining a livelihood, sent to ask for the dole of flannel which she had usually obtained.

"The vicar thus addressed her, 'Do you go to any Sunday school?' 'Yes, sir,' 'To which?' 'To the Independent, sir.' 'Then go to Mr. S. for your flannel,' and lest the timidity of the little child should save me the annoyance of being solicited, the vicar sent his lady after the girl, to whom she said, 'Now you will be sure to go to Mr. S. for your flannel!' The innocent little creature went home in high glee, and exclaimed, 'Mother, mother, get me my Sunday bonnet and frock, for the vicar says I must go to Mr. S. for my flannel!' 'Poor thing,' replied her mother, 'Mr. S. has no flannel to give thee, or else he would.' The next day, before I heard of this circumstance, a churchman sent me five shillings for our Sunday school. I was surprised to receive such a present from such a source, and very naturally desired to know the reason. Accordingly I called upon him and tendered my thanks. He then told me what I have related above; and added, that he was thoroughly disgusted with the bigot.

"Feeling determined that the poor little girl should not be disappointed, I purchased the flannel out of my own pocket, and took it her home, much to the joy of the family.

"3rd. In a country village where I regularly preach, one of my occasional hearers was visited by the parish priest, who wished to know why the mother of so large a family (nine in number) did not send her children to his Sunday school, and come herself with her family, at least once a day, to the established church. She answered, 'Why, sir, my father and mother were dissenters, (Baptist) and died happy in God, and I have no doubt they are now in heaven, and I intend myself and family

to be of the same persuasion.' What think you was the reply of this Puseyite minister? 'If your father and mother were not baptized by a minister of the Church of England, depend upon it they are now in hell.' I have merely given you these few instances, out of many, to show the kind of opposition with which I have continually to contend."

"In the village of P—— one of my people requested me to baptize her child. I of course complied. It had been intimated to her that if I was suffered to do so all further favours would be withheld. The Sabbath-day arrived; the child was brought, and I baptized it. After the service was over, the poor woman said, 'I have had a muckle (much) to do about this, but have conquered.' It having reached the ear of the Puseyite clergyman, he communicated the intelligence to the aristocratic squire, who, since, has severely reprimanded the father of the child for his misconduct, viz., in allowing an unauthorized teacher to perform a ceremony, which, instead of saving, will only destroy the soul of the child."

"In the village of C—— an interesting young man attends the chapel, and of late has manifested great concern for the welfare of his soul. He works for the squire. A few days since his master called him, and said, 'Well, John, I am informed that you attend the meeting-house, and hear an unauthorized teacher. It is only within the pale of the church that salvation can be obtained, and if you are resolved to attend that conventicle, you must leave my service.' The young man nobly replied, 'Sir, I have no desire to offend you, and should be sorry to leave your employ. In everything else I am willing to serve you, but in this instance I cannot. I have been to the chapel and heard Mr. ——, and for the first time in my life was led to exclaim, 'God be merciful to me a sinner;' and where I obtain good I think it my duty to attend.' His master turned away in a rage, threatening to discharge him should he visit the conventicle again. The young man still attends, and expresses his belief that as the hearts of all men are in the hands of the Lord, his master will not have power to discharge him. What a source of consolation to the persecuted lambs of Christ's flock that the Lord reigneth."

"One of the members of our little flock has recently been visited by the clergyman, who reproved her for not attending the church and receiving the sacrament. 'I always attend the chapel, sir,' was her reply, 'and for many years have celebrated the dying love of my blessed Redeemer there.' 'At chapel? I am perfectly surprised. You had far better go nowhere than to a conventicle; and as for taking the sacrament, it will add to your condemnation, whereas were you to receive it at the hands of a regularly ordained clergyman, an authorized teacher, it would save your soul.' The woman replied, 'The sacrament, I admit, sir, is an ordinance that is prized by every true believer of Christ, inasmuch as it gives him a lively view of the love of Christ. But if I wish to save my soul, I must look to the blood and righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, as no outward form or ceremony will ever gain me an admittance into the kingdom of heaven.' 'Ah, I find you have been with the canting hypocrites. Remember your destruction is certain, as you have turned your back upon the only true church.' 'I have not turned my back upon Christ, sir, and he will not turn his upon me.' 'I want no more of your cant; so good morning,' and away he went."

These are only a few cases from many which might be given of the kind of opposition to which Home Missionaries are exposed, in various parts of the kingdom. There are, however, certain circumstances that tend to lessen our anxiety, and should even lead us to hope that, after all, the opposition to the Gospel, and those who preach it, cannot extend much further than it does at the present moment, and that the cause of truth and righteousness is not perilled, if Christians will only do their duty. One circumstance is this, that churchmen themselves are beginning to be

alarmed, and are ably exposing the heresies which endanger souls. Connected with this, there is something like a re-action in favour even of dissenters, who faithfully hold fast the great doctrines of the Bible and preach them. Some of the publications by churchmen, which have recently issued from the press, show ability to defend evangelical truth, and a love for it, while several cases of liberality, on the part of churchmen, are, as far as they go, evidences of re-action in feeling. One case is that of two ladies, members of the establishment, successfully using their influence, in opposition to Puseyite power, to obtain a room in a destitute village for our agent, for the preaching of the gospel. Another is that of a gentleman, of the same communion, coming to the office of the Society, giving a handsome donation, and then adding to it another sum, in order to encourage the missionaries who are opposed by Puseyites. A third case is the liberal donation of thirty pounds from a clergyman, towards the erection of a village chapel, in the midst of parishes where Puseyite clergy are chiefly to be found; the donation being also accompanied with a promise of a further sum if galleries should be erected. In addition to these facts our agents state, that in certain districts the Puseyite clergy, by their high priestly claims, and violent denunciations of all not within the pale of their church, have so irritated some of their own people, that they have left their ministrations and gone to chapel, and now regularly attend the preaching of dissenters.

There is however another circumstance still more gratifying, because it is furnished by the success of the Gospel on many of the stations of the Society. The journals for one month, received up to the 10th of December, contain many intimations respecting individuals who have been proposed during the month for Christian fellowship, and this success has, in most cases, been in the midst of opposition. One says:—

“At our church meeting, on Friday evening, ten persons were proposed for fellowship. I believe God is working with us here. Good is doing. It has excited the minister of the establishment into miniature activity; but though by calling upon some, and speaking hard things of us; and in his church preaching baptismal regeneration, and the church, not the cross, he may confirm the prejudices of some, I firmly believe the more he stirs and the more he preaches in this style the better; it may lead to thought, and anything is better than constant apathy. All we have to do is to keep on our way preaching Christ; it must eventually overthrow everything that opposes it, however venerable for age or strong in human support.”

IRISH EVANGELICAL SOCIETY.

THE Committee of the Irish Evangelical Society are compelled to make a respectful but strong appeal to the friends of Protestant truth, on behalf of this valuable institution. Its constitution and usefulness are too well known, in this the twenty-ninth year of its important labours, to require any lengthened observations illustrative of their excellence; but it is due, alike to the claims of the Society and to the Christian public, candidly to state its present exigences, and the absolute necessity of prompt and energetic endeavours to rescue it from a position of great difficulty and danger.

For some years past it has, from various causes, received but a diminished support, compared with that of former periods, and during the past year circumstances have tended to decrease its income, and seriously to interfere with the efficiency of its operations. At the last annual meeting the debt due to the treasurer amounted to £738, while the responsibility of the committee has subsequently increased, by the usual outlay for the salaries of agents, and by a claim from the Congregational Union of Ireland, according to the terms of agreement adopted in June of last year. To meet this painful, and all but overwhelming difficulty, an appeal is now made, which if liberally responded to, as the committee believe it will be, the Society will be freed

from embarrassment, and be able by means of its annual income, which there is a fair prospect of increasing, to pursue its benevolent career in Ireland; while, in the absence of the help thus solicited, many of the agents now employed by the Society must at once be dismissed, and the promising fields of their labour be abandoned to the enemy.

The population of the sister isle, amounting to more than eight millions of people—the extensive domination of popery in that land—the increasing readiness of multitudes to receive evangelical instruction—the generous tokens of the Divine favour on the labours of many of our brethren—and the vast importance of the Congregational churches of this country bearing a steady testimony against the errors of Romanism in its high places—all furnish powerful considerations to induce a ready and munificent support to this Society. At a time, too, when the people have put from them the cup of intoxication, it devolves on all those who are concerned for the honour of Christ, and the redemption of immortal spirits, to present to them the cup of salvation, and to urge them to drink of the water of life freely. The future condition of our colonies, the evangelization of the nations, and the great struggle to which we are rapidly advancing in the contest between Protestant truth and Popish or semi-Popish error, will all be influenced greatly, as the cause of evangelical Christianity is advanced or retarded in Ireland. On these grounds the committee venture to ask their wealthier friends for large donations, and to entreat from those who are unable to offer largely, contributions proportioned to the ability with which God has blessed them. Stern necessity compels this application, and its result will determine the question whether this Society shall move onward with other institutions, or decrease in vigour till it be numbered with the things that were and are not. Our churches and friends have the power easily to avert such a catastrophe as that which would be involved in the overthrow of the institution; it is believed they will exercise that power, and this they are respectfully entreated to do without delay. Several liberal donations have already been received, and the committee trust that this example will be so generally followed by the friends of Protestant truth throughout the empire, that the existing difficulties of the Society will be speedily removed, and abundant thanksgivings be presented to Him to whom the gold and the silver belong.

Donations or subscriptions will be received by T. M. Coombs, Esq., the Treasurer, Ludgate Hill; or by the Rev. Thomas James and the Rev. George Smith, the Secretaries, 7, Blomfield Street, Finsbury.

COLONIAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

LETTER FROM THE DEACONS OF THE CHURCH AT SHEFFIELD, NEW BRUNSWICK,
ADDRESSED TO THE REV. H. WILKES, OF MONTREAL.

SHEFFIELD is a flourishing town and settlement, situate about seventy miles up the river St. John, from the city of that name. Mr. Wilkes visited this interesting people in the course of his recent tour through the British North American colonies on the Atlantic. Unable, from circumstances, to make the stay among them he wished, Mr. Wilkes requested a written account of the church. The following letter was accordingly transmitted to Mr. Wilkes. It presents an instructive illustration of the state of Congregationalism in the older colonies, as well as a fine opening for enterprise and usefulness, to a vigorous, devoted minister. We shall proceed in our next number with extracts from Mr. Wilkes's reports of the city of St. John, and the colony of New Brunswick, of which it is the capital.

"Sheffield, 18th October, 1842.

"REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—We deeply regret the short stay you made among us on your tour through the provinces, as we were much pleased with the discourse you delivered among us, but an *interview* would have been very desirable. We should no doubt have given you a more satisfactory account of our little church, but as you desired to have it sent to you, we shall endeavour to do it as briefly as possible. Our forefathers came from New England in the year 1764, and in 1768 a few pious Christians among them formed themselves into church order, agreeably to the Cambridge platform, and continued to assemble together on the Sabbath to worship God without any regular pastor, until about the year 1771, when the Rev. Seth Noble became their pastor, and continued to labour with them in word and doctrine for the term of six years, in which time the American war broke out, and the British government required the inhabitants of this province to take the oath of allegiance, which oath the said Seth Noble would not take, consequently he had to return to his native land, and left the church without any visible pastor. However, they continued the worship of God as before in singing, reading a sermon, and prayer; but in the year 1785, a Mr. Henry Allen, a minister of the Free-will Baptist Order, came into the place, and made a separation in the church, and drew much people after him. This left our church very small, and about one year after this, the Rev. Mr. James came and settled over them as a pastor. He continued about four years, in which time he changed from an Independent to an Episcopalian, and gave the lot of land which we had to help to support our minister into the hands of the churchwardens. It caused a lawsuit, and some of our members were cast into prison. However, they were shortly set at liberty, and we got possession of our land again, and affairs went on smoothly for a short time, but the clouds soon returned after the rain. About this time the place was visited by several ministers of the Wesleyan Methodists, and again a separation took place, which reduced our number very much, and to all human appearance we were like to become extinct as a church. But He who rules all things according to the counsel of his own will, has brought us through all these vicissitudes. About the year 1794, the Methodists formed a class, and in a few years built a chapel, and have continued to increase until the present time; and we believe there are many of God's chosen ones among them. But to return to our own church: we were left without any regular minister for the space of twenty-nine years, though we had several Presbyterian ministers occasionally. We applied for a minister, time after time, without success, until the year 1819, when the Rev. A. Macculum came to us from Scotland, and became our pastor. He reorganized our church, and laboured with success for nineteen or twenty years; he also formed four churches within the distance of twenty or thirty miles of this place. They contain from eight to eighteen communicants each, and are all destitute of a regular pastor. Mr. Macculum visits them occasionally, and breaks to them the bread of life. There is also a small church twenty-eight miles from this, who have a Secession minister over them for the present. However, after Mr. Macculum had laboured among us for the time above-named, he found the infirmities of age coming fast upon him, and he gave us notice that he wished to resign his pastoral charge. He requested us to get another minister, and hearing of a young man in Nova Scotia, who had just taken license to preach in the Secession church, and who was disengaged, we thought it our best way to employ him until there should be a door opened to get one of our own denomination, which door, we fondly hope, is opened by a kind Providence, through the Society of which you are the agent. Although the Rev. James Reid, our present minister, is a godly man, and we believe preaches orthodox doctrines, and the truth as it is in Jesus, yet it would be more satisfactory to us to have one of our own denomination, and also for him to be over a church of his own denomination, which he

has named to us, and proposed that we should make application through you. We believe that Mr. Reid wishes to follow where Providence seems to lead him, that he may be in his Master's work. His salary with us is about 110*l*. Dear Sir, we wish to apply to your Society, through you as agent, for a minister. We are in this place a mixed people. There are among us some Baptists, some Methodists, some Episcopalians, and some of no persuasion at all. We think that you are a competent judge what kind of a minister would best suit the place. Please let us know as soon as possible whether we shall be likely to get one this way, and how soon. We hope that our eyes will ever be unto the great Head of the church, to send us a pastor of his own choosing—a man called of God, as was Aaron. We are fully persuaded that if we had a godly smart man settled among us, we should soon be able to settle more, and have means to support them, among those other churches spoken of. And now may the God Almighty of power and grace bless and prosper you in your labour of love; and may you soon see every destitute part of the colonies supplied with faithful ministers of Jesus Christ.

"Signed on behalf of the Independent Church and Congregation in Sheffield, County of Sunbury and Province of New Brunswick.

"ISAAC BURKE, W. S. BARKER, Deacons."

TRANSACTIONS OF CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

INTENDED NEW INDEPENDENT CHAPEL, CAMDEN TOWN.

(With an Elevation.)

THE Metropolis Chapel Fund, at the earnest solicitation of the late Rev. Thomas Morell, resolved, more than four years ago, to erect a chapel in Camden Town. The design has not been carried into execution, in consequence of a plot of freehold ground being offered for sale in the city of Westminster; and it was thought desirable to lose no time in obtaining possession of it, and erecting a chapel appropriate in character and dimensions to so important a situation. Having, by the gracious providence of God, erected that chapel, and placed it in trust for the use of the church and congregation now assembling in it under the pastoral care of the Rev. S. Martin; they now feel it their duty to attempt the fulfilment of their pledge to their departed brother, the late president of Coward College.

Camden Town is a district in the parish of St. Pancras. Its population amounts to about 13,000. It has one Episcopal church, capable of seating about 2,000 persons, and two small dissenting chapels; the one affording seat room for about 200, and the other for 350 hearers. The population is increasing at a very rapid rate, from the influx of strangers from other parts of the metropolis, and the erection of extensive ranges of houses for their accommodation. There is every probability that this district will become one of the most populous suburbs of the metropolis, and from its being in the immediate vicinity of the terminus of the London and Birmingham railway may hereafter vie with many in importance.

The site for the chapel is a plot of ground on the western and higher side of the town, in Grove Street, and opposite the the corner of Warren Street. The design is furnished by J. Davies, Esq., of Devonshire Square, Bishopsgate. Two sets of plans have been drawn—one for a chapel capable of seating 827 persons, being 63 ft. long, by 44 ft. broad in the clear, and 26 ft. high—and the other to have seat room for 1,002 persons, being 73 ft. long, 47 ft. wide, and 30 ft. high. The estimated cost of the smaller chapel, including gas fittings and iron fence, with other items, is

£2,100; and of the larger £2,535. Both chapels are to have galleries; and 2 ft. 7 inches are allowed for the breadth of the pews.

The committee of the Association, fearing that a sufficient amount could not be raised, have determined to erect the chapel according to the plans for the smaller edifice. This is to be regretted; perhaps a word may not be now too late. A very large chapel may involve responsibilities too numerous and too heavy for any man to bear, but whilst we may fall into an error at that extreme, it is a still greater error to run to the opposite point. A small chapel cannot command the talent nor the attention which a chapel of suitable dimensions will generally do in a populous district. Besides, there is not the probability of usefulness in a small chapel which a zealous minister has in one of greater capacity. To feed the flock is a primary duty in the good shepherd, but he is also sent to seek and to save that which is lost. It is the miscellaneous character of large congregations that opens to the minister a prospect of usefulness. The new material stimulates him to constant effort, and keeps alive his hopes that his message may be a word in season to some. Indeed it is in such congregations that the ministry of the Gospel has achieved its most interesting and glorious triumphs. To all this may be added the fact that small congregations are seldom efficient in large towns. They have generally to struggle hard for existence, and can render but little help in providing for the spiritual wants of a vicinity, and still less for the carrying out of the ends and status of the church, into new and uncultivated ground. Why not take, at least, the plans for a chapel capable of accommodating 1000 persons? and should a debt of £500 or £1000 be left on the chapel, it would be better able to bear such an incumbrance and flourish with a vigorous minister, than a smaller chapel without any incumbrance at all.

The Association in taking this step is but tardily meeting the crying and still increasing necessities of the teeming population of the metropolis. But their operations involve heavy responsibilities, and much caution is requisite to avoid embarrassment and failure, if not despair. Even the established church, with all the means at its disposal, partly from the munificent grant of parliament, and partly from the contributions of its wealthy members, has done nothing to overtake the wants of the population, all having been absorbed in keeping up *the old proportion* between the population and the church accommodation. This is a fact that ought to impress the minds of all. But when it is remembered that in the judgment of some of the best of the ministers of that church, the provision that has been made, by the erection of new churches, has been rendered worse than useless, by the half-popish characters of several of the ministers who have been appointed to labour in them, all that love the truth, and are anxious for the spread of vital religion, will find in these facts two forcible reasons for additional effort. The first, to provide for the instruction of the souls that are still left to perish from total neglect; and the second, to correct the pernicious tendency of the dreaming heresies of these proud and deluded priests.—Now is the time for action.—They look to the altar; we must look to the pulpit.—The pulpit! the pulpit! must be our means of assault and defence. "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season," said the apostle Paul to Timothy. A full exhibition of the truth as it is in Jesus will do again what it did in the days of Luther, and in the days of Whitefield and Wesley. The people can understand the truth, but they cannot understand the ridiculous pretensions of a vain, dogmatical, and arrogant priesthood. The scripturally intelligent are on our side, and among the thoughtless we are at least as likely to obtain attention by the heart-stirring appeals which the Gospel suggests and inspires, as they by the performance of ceremonies, said to possess a virtue, but derived more from the hands that administer, than the authority that appointed them. Besides, this is the command of our Lord. We cannot fail of being successful in rolling back the clouds that are gathering around us, if we follow the

apostle's example, believing that the Gospel, and the Gospel alone, is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth.

A devoted spirit has now a fine field. Our colleges are undergoing most important and salutary changes. Vital evangelical piety looks for its asylum among the orthodox dissenters. The erection of commodious chapels, and providing an efficient ministry, in populous districts, have never failed, through the blessing of God, of drawing together large congregations. These have become, in many instances, signal blessings. To what can the wealthy better appropriate their property?—What more deserving of *munificent* donations, such as those of the respected treasurer of this Association, and as that of J. Green, Esq. at Poplar?—What more permanent blessing can such bestow than “building a synagogue,” and providing for a faithful ministry of the word and ordinances of God, for the salvation of a present and a coming generation?

The Independent Meeting-house at CASTLE HEDINGHAM, having been found too small to accommodate the congregation, it was resolved at a meeting of the subscribers, held March 25th, 1842, to enlarge and repair it. On the examination of the building by Mr. Fenton, the architect, it was found that such was the unsubstantial nature of the walls, that the intended alteration could not be effected; and the proposal to rebuild was unanimously received. On Thursday, September 22nd, the new building was opened for public worship. The services of the day were commenced by holding a meeting for prayer at 7 o'clock in the morning. At 11 o'clock in the forenoon, the Rev. T. W. Jenkyn, D.D., of Coward College, preached from 2 Cor. v. 15; and in the evening, the Rev. John Young, of Albion Chapel, Moorfields, preached from 1 Peter i. 23. The Rev. Messrs. Wallis and Verdon, of Sudbury; Prout and Johnson, of Halstead; Kay, of Coggeshall; Christie of Finchingfield, and others, took a part in the devotional exercises. The chapel was crowded at both the services; and the engagements of the day produced a delightful impression on the congregations. In the afternoon, twenty-two ministers, who were present, and nearly a hundred other friends, dined together, when several interesting speeches were delivered by both ministers and laymen. The building was much admired by those present for its neatness, and the chasteness of its style of architecture. The collections after the services amounted to £75. The total expense of the erection, exclusive of the materials of the old building, will amount to about £1300; towards which, £1050 have already been raised.

ORDINATIONS, ETC.

RECOGNITION SERVICE AT TOTTENHAM COURT CHAPEL, AND THE TABERNACLE, MOORFIELDS.—Three generations have passed away since the erection of these venerable edifices, which survive and stand as monuments of the greatest revival of religion vouchsafed to the world since the days of the apostles. These chapels were founded by the Rev. George Whitefield, the most extensively-travelled and laborious evangelist of modern times. This great man opened the Tabernacle, on Sabbath, June 10th, 1753, by a sermon, in the morning from 1 Kings, viii. 2, and in the evening, from 1 Chron. xxix. 9. He opened Tottenham Court Chapel on Sabbath, November 7th, 1756, preaching from 1 Chron. iii. 2; and the octangular building was added in the winter of 1760. In erecting the Tabernacle, he was both prompted and supported by Lady Huntingdon, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Hartley, Dr. Doddridge a dissenter, and Dr. Stonhouse a churchman; and when he laid the foundation of Tottenham Court Chapel, three of the most celebrated dissenting ministers of the time stood by him,—Dr. Benjamin Grosvenor, Dr. Thomas Gibbons, and Dr. Andrew Gifford, assistant librarian of the British Museum. Thus, at the very outset, Mr. Whitefield was the friend of good men of all parties, and to the close of his wonderful career, good men of all parties were his friends.

Mr. Whitefield's first colleague was the Rev. Torial Joss, a native of Aberdeenshire; on the death of Mr. Whitefield, the Rev. Matthew Wilks became Mr. Joss's colleague; on the death of Mr. Joss, the Rev. J. A. Knight became Mr. Wilks's colleague; the Rev. J. Hyatt was next associated with Mr. Wilks, and died before him; on the death of Mr. Wilks, the Rev. John Campbell, D.D., succeeded, in January, 1829, to the charge of both chapels, and has sustained the pastorship singly, till the month of December, 1842, when he was happily provided with a fellow-labourer and colleague in the Rev. J. W. Richardson, late of Sunderland.

Recognition services connected with this gentleman's settlement, as the joint pastor of the two congregations, were held in each chapel as follow:—

The first was held at Tottenham Court on Tuesday evening, December the 12th, when Dr. Jenkyn, of Coward College, proposed the questions; Dr. Henderson, of Highbury College, presented the special prayer; Dr. Bennett, of Falcon Square Chapel, addressed the minister; and Dr. Leifechild, of Craven Chapel, preached to the people. The Rev. R. Robinson, Witham, E. A. Dunn, Pimlico, Garvey, Kentish Town, Lyon, Albany Chapel, and Dr. Campbell, also took part in the duties of the evening.

Similar services were held at the Tabernacle on Monday evening, December the 19th, when the questions were proposed by Rev. J. Arundel, Southwark, and the special prayer was offered by Dr. J. P. Smith, of Homerton College. Dr. Vaughan, of Kensington, addressed Mr. Richardson, and Dr. Morison, of Chelsea, preached to the people. The Rev. J. Burnet, Camberwell, Dukes, Kingsland, Hewlings, Tottenham, Ransom, Hackney, and Dr. Campbell, engaged in the devotional and other services of the evening. Besides these solemn exercises there were sermons preached at each place by Dr. Jenkyn, and Mr. Sherman of Surrey Chapel. Early prayer meetings and social meetings were also held in connexion with this interesting occasion. All the meetings were very fully attended, and the principal services were crowded.

It may be interesting also to our readers to know that, within the last twelve years, both the chapels have undergone very great alterations and improvements. The copyhold of Tottenham Court Chapel, which was formerly held on lease, has been purchased at an expense of £14,000, and the chapel renovated at an expense of £6000 more, while British Day and Sunday Schools have been established in connexion with it.

The Tabernacle has, also, during the same period, undergone great alterations and improvements, promoting the comfort of the congregation, and adapting it to the improved taste of the times; while it too has received the important appendage of British Day and Infant Schools, in addition to its charity and Sabbath seminaries. The lease of this spacious building, and of the property connected with it, has, during the last autumn, been renewed by the corporation of the city of London.

The loose and uncertain state in which Mr. Whitefield's will left the property of these chapels, was, a few years ago, attended with serious disputes and litigations, which, however, issued in the happiest results to the congregations in both chapels; for the High Court of Chancery having established the charities, and declared the trusts, has defined the rights, duties, and privileges of all parties. The congregations are now reaping the invaluable fruits of the struggle, which to them, and the interests of religion in connexion with them, are above all price.

They were never before in the same state of economical and executive efficiency as at this moment, while their educational machinery adapts them to the wants of the age. Their management is now generous and popular, and the deed of trust securely provides that their ministry shall in all coming time be purely and thoroughly evangelical.

Most cordially do we wish that our able and honoured brother Dr. Campbell, who maintained this struggle, may find much pastoral comfort and success in the united labours of himself and his new colleague.

On Thursday evening, the 15th of December, 1842, a public service, intended to recognize the Rev. George Smith, as the pastor of the Independent church assembling in Trinity Chapel, East India Road, Poplar, was held in that place of worship, which was crowded in every part, long before the service began. The Rev. Charles Hyatt commenced the engagements of the evening with reading the Scriptures and prayer. The Rev. Dr. Fletcher delivered a comprehensive and eloquent discourse on the principles of Congregational nonconformity. The Rev. Thomas James proposed the usual questions, which were replied to on behalf of the church, by Mr. Thomas Williams, one of the deacons, who described the circumstances which led to the erection of this sanctuary, the formation of the church, and the settlement of the pastor; and Mr. Smith stated the reasons which had induced him to occupy his present sphere of labour. The Rev. Arthur Tidman then offered up solemn prayer mingled with thanksgivings to God. The Rev. James Sherman preached an impressive sermon to the pastor and the people, from the texts, "Take heed to thyself—Take heed to yourselves;" and the Rev. H. J. Bevis concluded with prayer. The Rev. W. Hodson, D. E. Ford, J. Upton, (Baptist,) and E. Halliday, conducted the other devotional services, and a large number of ministers attended to testify their fraternal interest in the newly-formed church and its pastor.

On Thursday, October 27, the Rev. John Daniel Morell, M.A., was ordained to the pastoral office, over the church assembling in the old Independent Meeting House, Gosport. The Rev. G. Silly commenced with reading the Scriptures and prayer. Mr. Burnet, of Camberwell, delivered the introductory discourse from 1 Cor. x. 15. Mr. Cousens, of Portsea, proposed the questions, which were duly answered by Jas. Hoskins, Esq., in the name of the church, and by Mr. Morell. Mr. Giles, of Newport, in the Isle of Wight, offered up the ordination prayer. Dr. Pye Smith, of Homerton, (one of Mr. Morell's tutors,) delivered the charge. Mr. Mudie, of Portsmouth, concluded with prayer. In the evening, Mr. Morris, (Baptist,) commenced the service by prayer. Mr. Adkins, of Southampton, preached to the people from 1 Thess. v. 12, 13. Mr. Currelly, (Wesleyan,) concluded with prayer. The Rev. Messrs. Parry, Stephens, Ford, Howell, and other ministers took parts in the service. Thirty ministers and many other friends assembled in the interval between the services, when the Rev. Mark Wilks, of Paris, addressed them at length upon the present very important circumstances of the evangelical cause in France.

Mr. J. E. Judson, of Hackney College, has accepted a unanimous invitation from the Independent church and congregation at Lindfield, Sussex, late under the pastoral care of the Rev. Jno. Chater; and intends, (D.V.) commencing his pastoral labours Sunday, January 1st, 1843.

On Wednesday, 19th of October, the Rev. Watson Smith, late of Blackburn College, was formally set apart to the pastorate of the church and congregation assembling in the Old Chapel, Stroud. The Rev. John Burder, A.M., minister of Bedford Street Chapel, delivered the introductory discourse, containing a clear and strongly defined outline of the nature of a Christian church, and an admirable defence of Congregational principles. The Rev. Henry Griffiths, theological tutor of Brecon College, late pastor of the church, asked the usual questions. The Rev. Richard Knill, of Wotton, offered up the ordination prayer, characterized by great spiritual beauty and strength. The Rev. S. T. Porter, of Darwen, Lancashire, gave the charge; a memorable exhibition of ministerial character and duties. It is to be hoped, for the sake of general interests amongst dissenters, that this discourse will be made public property. The Rev. R. Redpath, A.M., of London, closed the services of the day by an interesting and forcible address to the people.

The Rev. Samuel Davis, late of Needham-Market, Suffolk, has accepted an invitation from the Independent church at Harley Street Chapel, Bow, Middlesex.

Mr. W. H. Jackson, of Rotherham College, has accepted an invitation to the Congregational church at Howden-on-Tyne.

On the 19th Oct. 1842, the Rev. David Jones, late student of Airedale College, was solemnly set apart to the pastorate of the church and congregation at Booth, near Halifax. The Rev. J. Calvert, of Morley, commenced the service, by reading suitable portions of Scripture, and supplicating the Divine presence and blessing. The Rev. T. Scales, of Leeds, delivered the introductory discourse. The questions were proposed, and the answers received, by the Rev. J. Pridie, of Halifax. The Rev. W. Scott, president of Airedale College, presented the ordination prayer. The charge to the minister was delivered by the Rev. J. Sutcliffe, of Ashton-under-Lyne, from Col. iv. 17; and the Rev. John Ely, of Leeds, preached to the church and congregation, from Matt. v. 13—16. There was a numerous attendance of ministers and friends, from the surrounding neighbourhood. Many prayers were offered up for the peace and prosperity of the cause: and the overflowing congregations were deeply interested and impressed with the solemn services of the day.

The Rev. Alfred Newth, of Ripley, Hants, has undertaken the pastoral charge of the Independent church at Oundle, Northamptonshire, late under the care of the Rev. A. C. Simpson, L.L.D.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

SCOTTISH PLAN FOR A DEMONSTRATION OF PROTESTANT UNION.

It gives us sincere pleasure to place in the hands of our readers the following document. We shall look with deep interest to the opinion formed of it by "the Commission of Assembly" at its next quarterly meeting.

"The stated quarterly meeting of the Commission of Assembly took place on Wednesday, November 16th, in the High Church, Edinburgh—Dr. Welsh, Moderator of last Assembly, in the chair.

"Dr. Candlish, as Convener of Committee appointed to consider a letter which had been received from the General Assembly of the United States, on the subject of commemorating the bicentenary of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, which falls in July, 1843, gave in the following interim report, which at his suggestion was ordered to be laid on the table till next meeting of Commission:—

"The Committee have had under their consideration the letter from the Presbyterian Church in America, and also a letter from the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, on the same subject; and while they are not prepared to suggest a detailed plan, they beg to make an interim report to the Commission on one particular point.

"I. Besides the commemoration of this event by the several churches which hold the Westminster standards, separately and by communion with one another, the Committee are of opinion that advantage might be taken of this opportunity for attempting a joint or united meeting of Christians of different denominations, on a still larger scale, and in a wider and more catholic spirit. In particular, if any demonstration is to be made in London, it is doubtful whether it should be restricted to those churches exclusively who adhere to our symbols. That in Presbyterian communities, as Scotland, Ireland, and America, and among the Presbyterians in England, there should be solemn meetings, at which communications by deputations, or otherwise, may mutually be interchanged, is highly desirable and important. But in addition, there is every reason to believe especially from recent movements, that a proposal for a more general convocation of Evangelical Churches in London would be hailed with great satisfaction, and might be productive of much good; while it might be so arranged and conducted on the principle of a united testimony against

prevailing heresies and corruptions of various kinds, as to have an appropriate harmony with the Westminster Assembly itself, which, while it aimed at unity and uniformity, had for one of its leading objects the fencing of the true Protestant Church on every side, against Antichristian errors.

"II. Following out this idea, it is suggested that a plan for the constitution of such a meeting might be framed, which would be sufficiently precise to exclude heresy and disorder, and yet sufficiently wide and catholic to admit of all who hold the Head, which is Christ, joining in the consultations, as well as in any measures which might be adopted for the advancement of the principles of the Reformation, and the extension of the kingdom of Christ. Three points require, in this view, to be considered—the parties who are to meet, the terms of the meeting, and the object to be sought.

"I. The parties who are to convene.

"1. These should not be mere volunteers or self-constituted representatives of any section of the Christian church, but individuals duly named and commissioned by the respective bodies in whose name they are to sit.

"2. The bodies so naming Commissioners should be either the supreme assemblies of those churches which have such assemblies: or in the case of churches not having supreme assemblies, any association or society which is understood virtually to be the bond of union and the centre of action among any number of Evangelical Christians.

"3. By correspondence among the churches having recognized organs, and by the appointment of a joint committee for this purpose, consisting of members of different churches, this preliminary point, as to the bodies which are to send Commissioners, and as to the number of Commissioners to be sent by each, might be arranged and settled.

"II. The terms of meeting.

"1. Great difficulty might be felt in framing anything like a general creed or confession of faith in which all the Commissioners should concur. There are obvious objections to the statement of essential truth, in terms more wide and comprehensive than the several Churches have adopted in their respective standards; and there is manifest danger of schism or of latitudinarianism in such an attempt.

"2. But in entire accordance with the spirit of Protestantism, as well as with the exigency of the times, it is conceived that such a body of Commissioners from various evangelical denominations, might harmoniously and effectively meet and concur in a statement of errors renounced and opposed, rather than of truths held. And the errors which would require to be specified are of such a nature that the mere denial of them would be a sufficient guarantee for substantial soundness of faith.

"3. These errors are chiefly of three kinds; and the terms might be stated in the form of a protest against Socinianism or Rationalism, Popery, and what is called Tractarianism. The protest would thus embody a denial and renunciation—

"(1.) Of Socinian and Rationalist principles, as these affect—

"1. The inspiration and interpretation of Holy Scripture,

"2. The doctrine of the Trinity,

"3. The person of Christ,

"4. The doctrine of the Atonement.

"(2.) Of Popish principles, as these affect—

"1. The supreme and exclusive authority of Scripture,

"2. The doctrines of the Mass, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, &c.,

"3. The power of the Priesthood, Auricular Confession, Supremacy over Civil Rulers, &c.

"(3.) Of Popish and Tractarian principles, as these affect—

"1. The doctrine of Justification,

"2. The doctrine of Regeneration,

"3. The doctrine of the Sacraments,

"4. The Apostolic Succession, and the catholicity of the Church.

"III. The objects to be sought by such a meeting.

"1. The exchange of mutual and brotherly affection among various bodies of Protestants might be expected to strengthen and encourage the several churches in the good work of the Lord.

"2. While the meeting would, of course, be strictly precluded from all authoritative interference in the affairs of any of the bodies represented in it, and while controversial discussion on matters on which they differ must necessarily be avoided, a free interchange of advice and consultation might be encouraged: and by prayer and the searching of the Word of God together, light might be expected to be cast on the principles of our common faith, and the duty and prospects of the church at large, in the present critical state of the world.

"3. The various missionary operations of the several bodies or churches would furnish an interesting theme.

"4. The spectacle might be exhibited of Protestant unity, as distinguished from Popish uniformity and latitudinarian compromise.

"5. Out of such a meeting, besides the immediate advantage of a suitable commemoration of the Westminster Assembly, and a pleasing opportunity of brotherly fellowship in the Lord, some plan for future fellowship and co-operation might arise."

MEASURES FOR UNION BETWEEN THE CALVINISTIC METHODISTS OF WALES AND THE SCOTCH PRESBYTERIAN BODIES.

OUR Magazine for September last (pp. 647—48,) contained a paper on the proposed union of these two bodies. An intelligent correspondent, S. R., seems to have supposed that an act of ecclesiastical incorporation was contemplated; and proceeding on that assumption shows its impracticability from the construction of the constitutional deed of our Welsh brethren.

The following minutes of an association of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, held at Caernarvon, on the 7th September last, relating to a union between that body and the Scotch Presbyterians of England and the North, will show that his remarks were made in ignorance of the real state of the question:—

"The union between us and the Presbyterian churches was considered.

"After the visit received at Bala, from the brethren of the Presbyterian churches in England, a letter was received from the Association of *Seceders* in Scotland, declaring their attachment towards us; and desiring to have, if possible, some union with us.

"The following propositions were agreed upon, to be submitted to our Southern brethren in their association at Talygarth:—

"1. That we deem it to be a duty and a privilege to hold fellowship with other denominations, so far as we can do so without denying or concealing our religious principles.

"2. That we consider that we can accomplish this object without changing anything in our present order, as Calvinistic Methodists in Wales.

"3. That the co-operation in view does not extend in any manner to political matters; and that we do not as an association choose to meddle with such matters.

"4. That we do with the utmost readiness, in so far as is consistent with these views, extend the right hand of fellowship to the Presbyterian church in England, and to the Secession church in Scotland; and that we shall have much pleasure in corresponding with them, and in receiving visitors from them at our associations."

This seems truly to be a step in the right direction; let all the denominations to whom Mr. James refers act in the same manner, and we shall soon realize a general "Protestant Evangelical Union."

SUCCESS OF THE CHANCERY SUIT AGAINST THE UNITARIANS OF DUBLIN.

PRESBYTERIANISM was introduced into Ireland by the Scots settlers in Ulster, about the year 1608.

Independent of these Scottish Presbyterians in Ulster, and totally unconnected with them, considerable numbers of English Presbyterians settled in Dublin, Drogheda, Waterford, Limerick, Cork, Youghal, Bandon, and in other places in Munster. These parties went to Ireland to follow up commercial transactions as partners or agents of trading companies in Liverpool, Chester, and Bristol.

The English Presbyterians in Dublin and the south were distinguished from their Scottish brethren in the north, by not requiring *subscription* to the Westminster Confession. This arose from the fact that, before the Assembly closed its labours, it was discussed, whether candidates for the ministry should be required to subscribe to the Confession in token of their assent to its doctrines; but a motion to that effect was rejected by a great majority.

The Presbyterian Churches of Dublin were so decidedly orthodox that they deposed the Rev. Thos. Emlyn for Arian opinions, and he was afterwards tried in the Court of Queen's Bench, Dublin, 14th June 1703, for the publication of a book against the doctrine of the Trinity.* We record this fact, without approving of it, to show how abhorrent from their minds was the Unitarian scheme.

The pastors and wealthy lay members of these churches founded a General Fund, now yielding £900 a year, for the purposes of educating young men for the ministry, aiding small congregations in Munster to support their ministers, and of helping those congregations to build meeting houses.

This Fund fell, like many others, into the hands of Unitarian trustees, and the very pulpit from which Emlyn was expelled is occupied by a Unitarian preacher. A large part of this charity has been applied to the extension of Unitarianism.

Orthodox Presbyterians never interfered, till the success which attended the suit respecting Lady Hewley's property encouraged George Matthews, Esq., the author of the pamphlet referred to, to commence a suit in the Irish Court of Chancery against the Unitarian trustees. The arguments in this suit were heard for four days by the Lord Chancellor, in January, 1842, when Sir Edward Sugden decided that Unitarians must be excluded from all participation in, or management of the trust: but postponed his decree till the House of Lords had decided on the appeal in Lady Hewley's case. Sir Edward Sugden having been moved during the past month to dispossess the Unitarian trustees, and to fix them with the costs, gave his final judgment, in which he refused to impose the costs upon the Unitarian trustees, but ordered all *fifteen* to be removed, and new ones to be appointed, although there was no imputation against them, excepting their theological opinions.

* A very interesting pamphlet on this subject was published in 1839, by George Matthews, Esq., entitled "An Account of the Trial of the Rev. T. Emlyn, &c., with a Sketch of his Associates, Predecessors, and Successors."

REDUCTION OF THE PRICES OF THE SCRIPTURES BY THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

As old and steadfast friends of the British and Foreign Bible Society, we cannot withhold our congratulations from all its members on the fact, that at length its committee have seen their way clear to adopt a variety in their style of binding copies of the Scriptures, and to make a reduction in the prices fully equal, and, if we mistake not, exceeding that of their zealous and effective competitors.

It is to be wished that a *British Bible Society* had taken the first steps to effect these most important changes, but when its peculiar composition is considered, it cannot be a matter of surprise that certain conservative influences should have for a long time prevailed. Happily these have ceased to impede those measures which were rendered indispensable to the Society's continued prosperity as a *home* institution. While it is due to the committee of that institution to state that they were the first to break in upon the old monopoly of the universities, by calling into operation the patent of the king's printer, yet it is only just to add, that the public are indebted to other parties for the marked difference which now appears: and we must congratulate Mr. Childs, of Bungay, and Dr. Campbell, of London, and Dr. Adam Thomson and the Scottish Board for Bible Circulation, that the subscribers can now purchase at the Bible Society's House a ruby Testament, with gilt edges, for *seven-pence*, and a Bible bound in the same style for *eighteen-pence*. But we gladly refer our readers to the List in the Monthly Extracts that are stitched up with this magazine for the particulars, and hope that the Society, and all its friends, will now use their best efforts to secure a greatly increased circulation of the Word of Life.

BRIEF NOTES ON PASSING EVENTS.

WHEN we entered upon the year which has just closed, our circumstances as a nation were far from satisfactory. There existed the elements of a serious quarrel with the United States, while with the hordes of Afghanistan and the empire of China we were at open war.

By the blessing of the God of peace, treaties of amity have been concluded with the greatest republic and the greatest monarchy in the world, whilst the vanquished chieftains of Cabool are not likely again to provoke the invasion of their country by British arms. The influence of these pacific measures has been already felt by our commercial community, who begin to hope for the improvement in trade, after a long and almost unprecedented season of depression and suffering.

No further intelligence has arrived from China, and our Indian Empire again enjoys repose, which will be greatly promoted by the virtual proximity it has obtained to the mother-country, through the use of steam navigation in our intercourse with it.

The speech of President Tyler to the congress of the UNITED STATES has arrived, and contains passages that justify the hope that their late tariff, so injurious to our manufacturers, and so mischievous to their own morals, by encouraging smuggling, will be soon modified, and that some moderate duties will supersede those which now amount to prohibitions. Mr. Robinson's mission to Europe, to borrow in the name of the federal government ten millions of dollars, having completely failed, the President says—"The mortifying spectacle has been presented of the inability of this government to obtain a loan so small, as not in the whole to amount to more than

one-fourth of its ordinary annual income." It is indeed truly mortifying; but is there not a cause? The facility with which some individual States in the Union have repudiated their debts, and the failure of other States to pay the interest on theirs, have produced this general distrust, so that the government of America cannot now obtain a loan such as a few English noblemen or merchants could command in London, at a few days' notice. When the Duke of Wellington compelled the Parisians to restore the works of art that the Emperor had stolen, he spoke of giving a great moral lesson to Europe; if we mistake not, this distrust of American good faith will be a great moral lesson to the States, which cannot fail to produce a healthful, though by no means a pleasant state of feeling.

SPAIN has again been troubled by civil strife. An intrigue, it is reported, has been maintained by French agents, under the immediate direction of "the citizen king," with certain disaffected spirits in the city of Barcelona, and throughout Catalonia, to subvert the authority of the regent Espartero. The attempt, however, has signally failed, though not till the city had endured the horrors of a bombardment, for thirteen hours, during which nearly nine hundred projectiles were thrown into it with mournful effect, when the insurgents capitulated. The constant intrigues of the Popish clergy, and the personal pique of Louis Philippe, will account for the unnatural efforts of France to subvert the liberties of Spain, which however appear more strong now than on any former occasion of trial.

IN IRELAND we are happy to find that Her Majesty's government are resolved to stand by the National Board of Education, and to carry on its great work in defiance alike of Popish and Protestant bishops. The Viceroy has therefore attended the half-yearly examination of the masters, and witnessed the cordial co-operation of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Roman Catholics, to further this important means of national renovation. The spirit of Dr. Whately, archbishop of Dublin, was most Christian and appropriate; "I have been in particular," said his grace, "assailed in the most furious manner; I have been singled out for every calumny and obloquy; yet I have never been intimidated, and never provoked, and, by the blessing of God, I never will." Such a Christian temper, we trust, will protect Dr. Whately from the protests of the primate and six or eight other Irish bishops, who have done all in their power to give Popish priests an undue influence in the administration of this equitable system, by withdrawing their own.

IN SCOTLAND there has been a large and close convocation of the clergy on the non-intrusion question. They met in considerable strength to the number of 479, and passed two series of resolutions, which declare that, if they are not relieved from their present difficulties by some legislative enactments, they must separate from the church. It is not very probable that the present government will care to help them, and therefore the non-intrusion clergy will have to prove the sincerity of their professions by a most searching test. The authority of conscience was once displayed by *two thousand* ministers, who left their churches and their homes in one day; and the same grace will enable our brethren to "play the man for their people and for their God." Most disastrous will it be to the cause of evangelical religion in Scotland, if after these oft-repeated protestations, their courage fail in the day of trial.

AT HOME we have cause to be thankful that there are some indications of returning trade, but great distress still prevails both in the manufacturing and agricultural districts. Anglican popery is becoming more bold every day, and we anticipate that as our churches are especially abhorred on account of their Calvinism and their Independency, so upon them will mainly rest the duty of protesting against the revived errors of Rome. May God give to our brethren grace to be "valiant for the truth," so that by prayer, study, and testimony, they may fulfil the duties to which his providence may call them.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Rev. Drs. Henderson—Vaughan—Campbell—Hoppus—Leifchild.

Rev. Messrs. G. B. Kidd—D. Griffiths—G. Smith—T. Timpson—Thos. Coleman—S. Steer—S. Roberts—J. B. Shenston—C. J. Hyatt—J. C. Brown—Jas. Roberts—J. Robertson—R. Hunter—R. C. Pritchett—A. J. Morris—W. Owen—W. Davis.

Messrs. G. Gill—J. Cooper—J. Wilson—J. Benham—J. Purday—Hugh Owen—B. Franklin.

A Congregationalist—Le Fylde.

E. C.—A Young Congregationalist.

The Editor is obliged to Le Fylde, for his promise to forward denominational intelligence. All such communications are very acceptable.

He hopes that his approving friends will use their best efforts to extend the circulation of the Magazine, as no expense or trouble is spared to make it worthy the body it represents.
